DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 945 HE 004 797

AUTHOR	Jenkins, Jack; McQueen, Sidney
TITLE	College Unions at Work. Administration and Operation of the College Union.
INSTITUTION	Association of Coll. Unions-International, Stanford, Calif.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	319p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of College Unions - International, Box 7286, Stanford, California 94305 ($10.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Finance; *Higher Education; Physical Facilities; Professional Personnel; School Policy; Statistical Data; *Student Organizations; *Student Unions; *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; Japan; New Zealand; *United States

ABSTRACT

This study deals with administrative and operational patterns of 278 college unions located in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and Japan. Emphasis is placed on physical plant, organizational structure, professional staff, financial operation of the union, general union policies, relationship to departments, facilities, and two-year colleges. Appendices include statistical data on physical plants, organizational structure, professional staff, financial operation of the union, general union policies, relationship to other, facilities, and two-year colleges. (MJM)

ED 084945

COLLEGE UNIONS AT WORK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Association of College Unions - International
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Administration and Operation of the College Union

1

by Jack [illegible] and Sidney McQueen

HE 004 797

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084945

ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF THE COLLEGE UNION

by
Jack Jenkins and Sidney McQueen

Published by
Association of College Unions-International
Box 7286
Stanford, California 94305

Copyright by the Association, March 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEXT Page

Introduction vii
About the Authors xi
Acknowledgment xiii

Section I: Physical Plant

Building Status 2
Construction Costs 2
Construction Financing 3
Furniture and Equipment Financing 4
Use of Consultants 4
Expansion Plans 5
Conclusions 5

Section II: Organizational Structure

Union Policy-Making Body 7
Program Board 9
Program Committees 12
Conclusions 13

Section III: Professional Staff

Number of Professionals 15
Educational Background of Union Directors 16
Educational Background of Other Staff 17
Union Function of Staff Members 17
Line of Responsibility of Staff Members 18
Non-Union Function of Director 18
Prior Employment Experience 19
Conclusions 20

Section IV: Financial Operation of the Union

Union Fees 22
Union Revenue-Producing Departments 23
Bookstore 24

Guest Rooms 24
Concessions 25
Other Revenue Departments 25
Conclusions 26

Section V: General Union Policies

Business Matters 28
Program Matters 32
Office Space Practices 33
Building Maintenance 34
Miscellaneous Services 35
Conclusions 36

Section VI: Relationship to Departments

General Campus Activities 38
Student Government 39
Adult Education 39
Business Office 40
Conclusions 41

Section VII: Facilities

Recreation Facilities 42
Social Facilities 46
Cultural-Hobby Facilities 48
Meeting Facilities 51
Service Facilities 52
Food Facilities 56
Commuter Facilities 59
Organization Facilities and Offices 60
Stores and Other Facilities 64
Adult Conference Facilities 65
Conclusions 66

Section VIII: Two-Year Colleges

Physical Plant 72
Organization Structure 73
Professional Staff 75
Financial Operation 76
General Union Policies 77
Facilities 79
Conclusions 80

Recommendations 82

APPENDIX

Physical Plant (Tables 1-20) 87
Organizational Structure (Tables 21-46) 133
Professional Staff (Tables 47-63) 153
Financial Operation of the Union (Tables 64-83) 173
General Union Policies (Tables 84-119) 193
Relationship to Other (Tables 120-128) 235
Facilities (Tables 129-176) 243
Two-Year Colleges (Tables TW1-TW49) 277

INTRODUCTION

Many studies have been conducted on the various aspects of the college union. Many approaches have been used to examine the college union's philosophies, objectives, functions, operational methods and standards, and program fundamentals. This study is the fourth that deals with administrative and operational patterns of college unions in the past 20 years. Previous studies were made by Edgar A. Whiting (1951), Abe L. Hesser (1957) and Boris C. Bell (1962). This study makes comparisons, wherever possible, with the data provided in Bell's study.

A 15-page questionnaire, similar to the one used by Bell, and a five-page supplemental questionnaire, were used to compile the data for this study. The supplemental questionnaire was designed to clarify certain data in the original questionnaire and to expand other areas. The supplement was sent only to respondents to the original questionnaire. The survey instrument dealt with a wide range of the complex operational aspects of the college union and gave coverage to seven general areas: Physical Plant, Organizational Structure, Professional Staff, Financial Operation of the Union, General Union Policies, Relation of the Union to Other College or University Departments, and Facilities.

No pilot study was made because the Bell questionnaire was available and because of a time shortage. The questionnaire, accompanied by a cover letter from the Association's president, was sent to 891 members in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. Three follow-up post cards were sent to non-respondents of the original questionnaire, and three follow-up post cards were sent to non-respondents of the supplemental questionnaire. A reminder was also put in the June, 1971, ACU-I *Bulletin*.

An overall response of 37% (330 returns) was recorded. Fifty-two of the responses were unusable:

23—planning or construction stage
11—no union
5—facilities too small
13—other reasons, such as no time, reorganizing, did not apply to situation

The 23 schools that had unions in the planning or construction stage are listed in Table 19.

A net response of 278 schools—31.2% of the total (regular and associate) Association membership—was finally used (compared with 37.5% in the 1962 survey, 45% in the 1957 survey and 71% in the 1951 survey).

It should be noted that only 649 of the 891 Association members (in 1971) had union buildings; if the percentage of responses were based on the first figure it would, of course, be much higher. Undoubtedly, the length of the questionnaire was largely responsible for not having a better overall response. Also, as the size of the Association grew, the *percentage* of responses decreased, but the *number* of responses increased: 278 in the current study, 190 in the 1962 study, 108 in the 1957 study and 92 in the 1951 study.

The following general information is offered to describe the character of the net response. Included in the response were three institutions from Canada, four from Australia and one each from New Zealand and Japan. The following chart compares responses used in the 1971 study with those in the 1962 study and the total number of members of the Association with buildings in 1971.

Enrollment of Participating Institutions (undergraduate only)	1962 (Bell) Study		1971 (current) Study		Total No. of Members of Assn. w. Bldgs. in '71	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 2500 students	65	36	86	31	291	44.8
2500–4999 students	48	27	66	24	137	21.1
5000–9999 students	35	19	60	21	125	19.3
Over 10,000 students	32	18	66	24	96	14.8
Total	180	100	278	100	649	100.0
Public Institutions	130	68	187	67		
Private Institutions	60	32	91	33		
Total	190	100	278	100		
Established before 1957	110	61	152	55	Established before 1962	
Established 1957–62	70	39	126	45	Established 1963–71	
Total	180	100	278	100		
Building opened in year preceding study	10	5.6	38	13.7		

The four enrollment categories used in this study reflect undergraduate enrollment only and are similar to those typically used in surveys by the U.S. Office of Education. The 1971 average results are weighted more toward the larger institutions of more-than-10,000 students than those of the Bell survey and are over-represented in comparison with the proportion of institutions with more-than-10,000 enrolled that are included in the total membership of ACU-I. As can be seen in the above statistics, the ratio of public institutions to private institutions responding in this survey is almost exactly the same as the ratio in the Bell survey. In relation to total responses, the participating schools were fairly evenly divided among all enrollment categories.

The reason for dividing the unions into two building age brackets was to afford, wherever possible and useful, a comparison of unions established in recent years with those developed before 1962, the date of the Bell study, to discern possible trends. As shown above, 45% of the participating unions were established since the previous survey, in 1962, compared with the 39% in the 1962 study that had been established since the previous survey in 1957. Therefore, the total results of this survey are more heavily weighted toward the "newer" unions than in 1962—although the newly established unions in this study cover a span of nine years (1962-71), compared with a five-year span (1957-62) in the Bell study. So post-1962 unions in this study do not actually reflect very "recent" developments at least in the sense they did in the Bell study.

It should also be pointed out that 13.7% of the newly established unions represented in this survey had opened only in the year prior to the study—almost twice as many as the 5.6% that opened in the year prior to the Bell study. Therefore, data in the areas of programming and program committees, determining staff requirements or settling upon ultimate union fees required, operating policies, governing structure or relationships with other college agencies from the 38 unions less than one year old may well represent, in many cases, only temporary expedients since they had not had the opportunity to develop fully.

Another important factor is that 33 (12%) of the respondents in this survey are two-year colleges, compared with only three (less than 2%) in the Bell survey. This could affect the average results in terms of physical plant size, nature and scope of program, staffing, committees and certain policies since two-year colleges generally are small (28 of the 33 are in the fewer-than-5,000 enrollment groups) and provide modest union facilities, staffing and programming. In order to learn more about the special characteristics, if any, of these unions, Section VIII is devoted exclusively to two-year colleges, providing information in the seven areas covered for four-year colleges, but to a lesser degree.

Furthermore, this study's pre-1962 group of unions, which was compared with the post-1962 group of unions, is not, by any means, the same as the pre-1962 group studied by Bell. Of the 180 unions responding in Bell's study, half were not represented in the current study. Included among these 90 non-responding unions were many of the largest, oldest, best developed and most sophisticated (in terms of programming, governance and operations generally) of all unions. Had these 90 responded to the 1971 survey, they would have represented one-fourth of the sample (90 of 278 plus 90, or 368) and probably would have influenced substantially all outcomes of the survey—especially size of physical plant, staff, method of government, scope and kind of programming and operating practices—usually upward in quantitative terms and toward improved practices, operations and programming in qualitative terms. In short, this is another strong indication that this survey is not as representative as one could have hoped. It suggests that the 1971 results shown by any given tabulation of responses should not be taken at face value but only as broad indications of what 31% of the Association's membership *was doing*, not necessarily what *all* were doing or what *should be* the practice. The reader will note that the results are often at variance with the Association's goals and recommendations as outlined in its "role" statement and various publications.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jack Jenkins is assistant director of admissions at Mt. Hood Community College in Oregon. After earning his B.A. from Sacramento State College, he was a counselor and recreation supervisor with the Job Corps and later became a teacher-coach in secondary schools in California.

As a graduate assistant, Jenkins coordinated the recreational sports programs of the Memorial Union at Oregon State University, where he received his master of education degree in 1971. Before his present appointment, Jenkins was a counselor at Mt. Hood Community College. He is author of *China Slough*, a monograph published by the Sacramento County Historical Society in 1966.

Sidney McQueen is director of college activities-union at Carroll College in Wisconsin. After serving four years in the U.S. Navy, he earned his B.S. from the University of North Dakota. As a graduate assistant he was an assistant night manager at the Memorial Union at Oregon State University, where he received his master of education degree in 1971. McQueen was previously assistant dean of men-union director at Carroll College.

McQueen is a member of the Research Committee of the Association of College Unions—International. In 1970, he authored a paper on *The Professional Union Staffing of Region 10 of ACU-I.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This survey has taken a year and a half to complete, and in that time many people have been of important assistance to us. The authors are especially grateful to George Stevens, director of Memorial Union-Student Activities, Oregon State University, for his encouragement and assistance in initiating the up-dating of the 1962 Boris Bell survey.

We would like to thank the Association's Research Committee for providing the financial assistance that made this project possible.

Also appreciated is the use of the original questionnaire developed by Boris Bell, which provided a base for comparison and a determination of trends in the last 10 years.

A special thank you should be made to Porter Butts for his time and effort on our behalf. Mr. Butts not only gave us encouragement throughout the project, but his extensive suggestions and additions in areas with which we were unfamiliar added greatly to this study.

Not to be forgotten are the hours of work contributed by our wives Judie and Patty. Without their editing, typing and continuous support, this study would have been an almost insurmountable task.

J.C.J.—S.J.M.

Section I: PHYSICAL PLANT

The trend toward college education has not only increased enrollments at educational institutions but expanded facilities, including college unions. Because of the marked growth in unions, physically and numerically, a review of physical plant considerations is an important requirement in a descriptive study. This section traces the chronological growth and physical plant development of college unions as illustrated by the 278 unions that responded in the 1971 survey, emphasizing building size, costs, use of consultants, methods of financing and anticipated expansion plans.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Chronological Development of Union Buildings Listed in This Report

Two-hundred-seventy-four institutions listed the date their unions were established. The following breakdown indicates a pattern of rapid union growth in recent years:

Date	*No. Unions*
1896-1925	11
1926-1935	17
1936-1945	14
1946-1950	8
1951-1957	43
1958-1962	58
1963-1968	71
1969-1973	52

Had the 649 regular ACU-I members (institutions that are known to have union buildings) responded, the proportion of unions established in the 1960s would have been much larger. Almost half (45%, or 123) of the unions included above opened after Boris C. Bell's study *Adminis-*

tration and Operation of the College Union in 1962, so data received from unions established in the last nine years influences the findings almost as much as the data received from unions established before 1962—66 years of union history.

Building Status (Tables 1 and 2)

Of the 278 responding schools, more than half (54%, or 150) were operating in their original building only (compared to 59% in the 1962 study). An additional one-fourth (26%, or 72) were operating in their original building plus one addition. Another 13% (35) were operating with two to five additions and the original building (8%—two additions, 4%—three additions, 1%—four additions, 1%—five additions). Six per cent (18) listed replacement buildings. With the expansion of campuses in the mid '60s came a relatively new development in the union field—the satellite union. Three schools (1%) had built satellites as well as additions for use with their original buildings (see Table 1).

Union space provisions, shown in Table 2, were based on gross square footage of the total physical plant used by the 262 respondents to this question. The results show that 60% (157) were operating buildings of less than 100,000 square feet (compared to 66% in the Bell study). All but 33 of these had fewer than 5,000 students enrolled.

Further data relating school enrollment size to union building size is in Table 20; from these data the number of gross square feet per full-time student (in 1971) can be determined for a given institution.

Readers should be cautioned that there are certain limitations to the data pertaining to union size:

■There were many minor discrepancies in the figures given in the original compared to the later supplemental questionnaires.

■Some returns may reflect net instead of gross square footage figures.

■The figures listed by many respondents should not be taken as a measure of adequacy of their physical plants. A third of the respondents are either planning extensive additions (64) or replacement or satellite buildings (28).

Construction Costs (Tables 3-7)

Construction costs of original union buildings plus additions, exclusive of furnishings, equipment and fees, were given by 227 schools. Close to one-fourth (23%, or 52) reported expenditures of less than $1 million—a marked decline from the Bell study, which showed 40% spending less than $1 million.

Only 4% of the responding schools in the Bell study had construction costs of more than $5 million. The current study lists 11% (25) with construction costs ranging from $5-10 million.

All data were significantly influenced by the charting of costs through a 76 year period. The tremendous rise in building costs—almost 100% since 1962—largely accounts for the sharp upward trend in union dollar investment, although there also appears to be a trend toward including more kinds of facilities and more square feet per student in the union. In order to provide more meaningful construction-cost data, expenditures for new union buildings and additions during 1963-72 only are charted in Tables 4 and 6.

Thirty-eight (28%) of the 132 respondents spent $30-40 per square foot when building unions after 1963 (Table 5). The median cost was $27. This is a significant increase since the Bell study, which showed unions most frequently spent $16-24 per square foot in 1957-62, with a median cost of $19. However, as mentioned before, steeply rising building costs in the 1960s account for this.

The only significant departures from this upward trend were six schools that listed costs from $10-12.

Construction costs of *new additions* were $20-24 per square foot for a quarter (17) of the 70 respondents. Twelve schools (17%) listed a cost of $35-40 per square foot. The median was $28 per square foot.

It should be remembered that costs reported in this study spanned a 10-year period from the early 1960s to the early 1970s, with costs running considerably higher at the end of the period. In 1972 the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Agency was allowing up to $50 per square foot for HUD supported union loans.

Construction Financing of Original Buildings (Tables 7-10)

The methods of financing the construction of original buildings were measured in terms of public and private institutions. The survey included 187 public and 91 private institutions (Tables 8 and 9).

The most frequently used source of funding by *public* institutions was revenue bonds (53, or 37%). Of these, 25 borrowed more than 90% of the construction cost from revenue bonds. The next two most prevalent sources of construction financing were city, county and state appropriations and union fee accumulations. City, county and state appropriations were the main financing sources for 26 of the 39 institutions using them (27%). In 1962 only 15% of the public institutions reported receiving city or state appropriations. Union fee accumulations were listed by 35 schools (24%); 21 financed more than 90% of building costs from this source.

Public institutions also made important use of three other main sources. College funds were indicated by 22 institutions (15%), although 10 used college funds for less than 30% of their total financing. Large gifts and general subscription were listed by 18 (12%) and 17 (12%) schools, respectively, compared with 13% for large gifts and 22% for general subscription in Bell's study. The use of general subscription was spread evenly in all "per cent-of-cost" categories, ranging from less than 15% to more than 90%. Although 18 schools (12%) used large gifts as a source, 12 received less than 30% of their financing through large gifts.

Private institutions most often used large gifts and college funds for construction costs. Thirty schools (41%) used large gifts, and 11 of these said it was their main source (30% also reported using large gifts in 1962). College funds were listed by 27 institutions (37%) with no dominant percentage range. Nineteen institutions (26%) reported borrowing from HUD or its predecessor, HHFA; 12 of the 19 used this source for 60-100% of their total construction financing cost.

Comparisons with funding methods reported in the Bell study are not possible because revenue bonds, a principal source of financing then and the leading source of financing shown in this study, were omitted from the Bell questionnaire.

Furniture-Equipment Financing of Original Buildings (Tables 11-13)

A pattern similar to that in construction financing was found in the financing of furniture and equipment. In *public* institutions (Table 11) the main sources again were revenue bonds (26%), city, county or state appropriations (27%) and union fee accumulations (22%), with the overwhelming majority using these sources for more than 90% of furnishings-equipment costs.

Large gifts (36%) and college funds (36%) were again the principal sources of funding at *private* institutions, with the majority, once more, realizing more than 90% for furnishings-equipment costs from these sources.

Few public or private institutions financed equipment through HUD because the federal agency only loans funds for certain fixed equipment.

Use of Consultants (Table 14)

Four types of planning consultants were listed most frequently: general-building planning consultants, specialists in design and interior furnishings, bookstore planning consultants and food service layout consultants. Tabulation of the figures was divided into five stages of building construction: original building, first through third additions and the replacement building. Seventy per cent (132) used an interior design consultant in one or more of their building projects. Sixty-three per cent (119) used general-building planning consultants in one or more building phases. Half (89, or 49%) used bookstore consultants, and a third (62) used food service consultants.

The proportion of unions using consultants was substantially higher than in 1962, when an interior design consultant was used by 54%, general building consultant by 50%, bookstore consultant by 22% and food service consultant by 21%—indicating a decided trend toward using planning specialists since 1962.

Expansion Plans (Tables 15-18)

Expansion plans were tabulated in four charts: estimated area (Table 15), estimated cost (Table 16), type of expansion (Table 17) and estimated date of construction (Table 18). The unknown categories in three of these charts are not necessarily from the same schools. Unless three of the four questions on expansion were answered, the response was not used.

One-third of the schools (92 of 278 respondents) listed union expansion plans; of these, 62 estimated their size at less than 100,000 square feet. Most of these were divided among the three larger-school size categories. Fourteen schools had plans but were indefinite as to the size of the expansion.

Estimated cost of expansion plans ranged from less than $25,000 to more than $7 million. No predominant cost range was indicated. However, 33 schools (36%) estimated $1-3 million. Nineteen of those planning expansion had no estimates.

Sixty-four schools (70%) reported plans for additions and 17 (18%) for replacement buildings. Eleven (12%) planned branch or satellite buildings. Of these, 53 were in the more-than-5,000 enrollment category.

Estimated dates of expansion showed that 29 schools were to expand union facilities in 1972 and 43 were to expand by 1975. Twenty schools did not know when construction would begin.

CONCLUSIONS

Rapid growth continues in both the physical size and the number of college union buildings. Of the 274 unions providing a building construction date, 45% had been built since 1962 (see Table 19). Also significant is that 45% of the responding unions had already either enlarged or replaced original union facilities, and a third were planning further additions or entirely new buildings. Growing enrollments, increasing recognition of the important role of the college union and availability of federally-supported loans generally account for the enlargement of originally designed facilities. For some unions the larger physical size of the campus had produced the phenomenon of the branch or satellite union.

Of the 262 unions that furnished square foot data in this survey (Table 2), the median size was more than 75,000 gross square feet, compared to a median of 62,500 square feet indicated for 146 unions in the Bell study. The median investment (construction only) for the 227 unions responding (Table 3) was about $2,125,000, compared with $1,250,000 for 140 unions in the Bell study.

The 1960s saw the appearance of unions at two-year colleges; 33 (12% of the total sample) responded in this survey, none in 1962. Since two-year colleges were usually urban and relatively small in enrollment, they usually built smaller unions (see Table 20). One of every 10 respondents was a two-year college, which somewhat offset the growing size of unions (and investment) at four-year colleges and reduced averages relating to size of physical plant (Table 2) and to dollar investment (Table 3). If two-year colleges had been omitted from these tables, the median size of unions (even for enrollments of fewer than 2,500) and median investment would have been larger.

Construction costs of union buildings are increasing spectacularly. The median cost per square foot in 1957-62 was $19. For unions built in 1963-72, the median was $27, and in 1970-71 costs were more typically near $40 per square foot.

Borrowing, either through revenue bonds or HUD (45%), was the predominant source of financing unions at public institutions—often more than 90% of the cost. Large single gifts (41%) and college funds (37%) were principal sources at private institutions. There was a noticeable trend at public institutions to rely on city or state appropriations for partial financing and less reliance on general subscription campaigns. In contrast, private institutions increasingly had depended upon large single gifts.

A substantially higher proportion of unions used consultants in building planning than those who reported in 1962.

Section II: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

It has long been recognized that college union boards and committees play a prominent role in the operation of their unions. While the functions and composition of these governing and programming groups have been diverse, recent years have produced a trend toward uniformity. As did the Bell study, this survey made no attempt to determine the areas of governing board responsibility. (See the Durrett-Robinson study, *Governance of the College Union*, for information on this area.) Instead, major emphasis was placed on organization considerations.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Union Policy-Making Body (Tables 21-25)

Results indicated that 87% of the unions (241 of the 278 respondents) had policy boards, compared with 75% in the Bell study—a marked upswing.

Tabulations of policy board memberships were broken down by age of the union. While the composition of the policy board included 16 categories of membership, only 12 categories were regularly indicated. Although the number of representatives from different categories shifted, the pattern of membership, once again, did not significantly change. The following table compares the Bell and current studies in terms of the degree of participation on union policy boards by representatives of various groups and agencies. The figures listed combine responses from unions established both before and after 1962.

Group Represented on Policy-Making Board	*Total Unions Including Representatives on the Board*			
	This Study		Bell Study*	
	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	207	86	122	90
Student Government	186	78	118	87
Faculty	173	74	125	93

Group Represented on Policy-Making Board	*Total Unions Including Representatives on the Board*			
	This Study		Bell Study*	
	No.	%	No.	%
Union Program Board	158	66	95	71
General Student Body	150	62	75	55
Student Affairs Office	121	51	88	65
Alumni	80	33	72	53
College Business Office	71	30	62	46
Institution's Governing Board	44	18	40	30
**Other College Administrative Officers	44	18	11	8
College Vice-President	28	12	37	27
College President	24	10	66	49

*This study based on 241 schools, Bell study on 135.

**Includes such people as dean of administration, dean of student life, dean of extension center and assistant provost for budgets.

The average policy board continued to reflect the broad representation of the college community essential to good governance of the union. As shown above, consistently included on the board (in more than half the unions) are representatives of faculty, student government, union board, general student body, union staff and student affairs office. Fewer unions specify the category from which representatives shall be selected.

Less involvement of the president is understandable in the current era when presidents are occupied with new concerns. Alumni representation tends to be omitted when alumni have not had a part in raising funds for the union, which has been more and more frequent recently. However, why representation of student government, faculty, business office and student affairs office—all strongly recommended by the Association—should decline is puzzling. In some cases, perhaps, representation has been shifted from business and student affairs offices to other administrative officers. Thus, the decline in representation from the student affairs office, business office, vice-president's office and president's office has been somewhat offset by the 400% increase in "other college administrative officers." Some institutions may not realize, or believe in, the value of faculty and administration representation. Or they may so organize the union that most policies are decided administratively, with the union "policy" board serving in only an advisory capacity and therefore needing only student and union staff members.

Comparing the patterns of representation in the two age groups also indicated that the role of the president declined—from 13% participating in pre-1962 unions to 7% in post-1962 unions. Similarly, faculty representation decreased from 74% to 69%. On the other hand, student government representation increased from 73% of pre-1962 unions to 82% of those established in 1963-72. This may be explained by the large number of small unions and two-year college unions organized during

1963-72, often under the auspices or control of student government.

The selection of the policy board was found to be predominantly by appointment (Tables 21 and 22). Determination of responsibility for selecting board members was attempted, but an ambiguous question rendered the information obtained unusable.

One-hundred-eighty-eight schools responded to the question, "The policy-making body is responsible to what authority?" (Table 23). Fifty-one institutions (27%) indicated that the policy body was responsible to the union staff. This is particularly true for unions established in 1963-72, many of which were new, small, or at two-year colleges, and true "governing" status had probably not been established for the policy body. Most frequently, the policy board reported to the institution president, vice-president or general governing board (in a third of the unions); 27% reported to the union director and 15% to the student affairs dean.

In both pre- and post-1962 unions, the chairman of the policy board was most often the student representative of the union program board (32%) or student government (16%, Table 24). Student representatives were listed as chairmen in the "other" category which totaled 21%. Administration or faculty representatives were chairmen of 19% of the boards. The groups represented by chairmen changed little between age groups.

The policy-making board most frequently met on a monthly basis (35%, Table 25). One-fourth of the boards met weekly, and close to one-fifth (17%) met semi-monthly.

Program Board (Tables 26-37)

Students predominated on union program boards, which were mostly composed of program committee chairmen and, to a lesser extent, representatives of the general student body and student government. While a union staff member was still a traditional member of the program board, he usually served in an ex-officio, non-voting, advisory capacity. This was true in more than half of the unions in both age groups. While general student body representation increased 8% (from 54% of pre-1962 unions to 62% of post-1962), the role of student government declined from 40% to 34% post-1962. Representation by student chairmen of program committees decreased from 76% to 72% in the post-1962 unions. These trends were indicated by the Bell study, which also showed an increase in the role of other representatives of the general student body. This increase may be due, as Bell said, to the tendency to choose general-student-body representatives first and then place them in charge of program committees rather than naming program chairmen first and then placing them on the program board. There was evidence of increased participation by student affairs deans in younger unions.

The following table illustrates the degree of participation on union program boards by the various union constituencies. The figures listed combine respondents of both age groups.

Group Represented On Program Board	*Total Unions Including Representatives on the Board**	
	No.	*%*
Union Staff	165	82
Student Chairmen of Program Committee	149	74
General Student Body	116	58
Student Government	75	37
Faculty	44	22
Student Affairs Dean	38	19

*Based on 201 schools responding.

Of the 278 responding schools, 29 (10%) indicated they had no program board, and 41 (15%) indicated one board served as both policy and program board; the latter result was possibly influenced by the fact that 15% of the unions opened the year before the survey. There was little difference between the percentages of older and newer unions with no program board. However, the percentage of those established since 1962 who listed a combined program-policy board 28%, was double that of the pre-1962 unions—14%.

Although *appointment*—by a union or non-union authority—continued as the overwhelmingly prevalent method (81%) of selecting student members of the program board, use of *election* by the general student body increased (Table 32). The Bell study showed the general student election as the method in 12% of unions established before 1957 and in 16% of unions established in 1957-62. This survey shows that 18% of unions established before 1962 and 21% of those opening in 1963-72 used the election method. Although election is a departure from the guidelines of the Association, its popularity may be influenced by the number of small, new unions and two-year colleges, where general elections are an established pattern. Selection of faculty-staff, including union staff, followed the expected pattern of appointment.

No major change in the ex-officio status of representatives was indicated (Tables 26 and 27). The only area of variation was student government, which showed a slight decrease, in keeping with its decrease in representation on the policy boards.

The 1971 study maintained the three main sources of authority over the program board that were indicated by the Bell study (Table 28): union policy-making board (26%, or 57 schools), student government (23%, or 51) and union staff (23%, or 50). The use of the union policy-making board as an authority source decreased from 31% to 20%

in post-1962 unions; while use of student government as an authority increased from 18% to 30%, and use of union staff as a source of authority increased from 21% to 25%. This may be explained by the fact that 25 of the younger unions (22%) used a program board that was also the policy board.

Almost half (111) the unions named the policy-board representative as their choice for program-board chairman (Table 29). Three other groups were listed frequently: general student body (elected, 15%), student government (14%) and "other" (14%). Using the policy-board representative as chairman increased from 44% to 53% when comparing the two age groups. Use of student government representatives as chairmen increased 10% (from 10% to 20%) in post-1962 schools, while election by the general student body decreased from 19% to 10%.

Two-thirds of the program boards met weekly, in contrast to the policy board's monthly schedule, which further emphasizes the fact that the program board is the key working group in the union organization. However, 10% of program boards in pre-1962 unions and 19% of those in post-1962 unions had shifted to semi-monthly meetings (Table 30).

The universal method of selecting program-board *non-student* members was appointment—by the president, dean, union or a special committee (Table 31). Union Staff members were on the boards by virtue of their positions (52%) although, as stated earlier, they usually served in a non-voting, advisory capacity.

Appointment of *student* members (Table 32) was principally by the program board itself (27% of the unions), the policy board (10%), student government (7%) or student government and program board (4%). A quarter became members through "interview," "appointment," or "volunteering"—presumably appointed by the program board or policy board.

Student participation in the work of the program board remained, to a high degree (75%), on a non-salary basis. Compensation for program-board members decreased in the last nine years from 32% in older unions to 18% in newer unions (Table 33), a shift from the Bell study, which showed an increase in compensation by newer unions. The most frequently compensated member of the board was the president (Table 34).

Thirty-three of the 59 schools that compensated board members paid $251-1,000 a year (Table 35). Seventeen paid $251-500 a year; 16 paid $501-1,000 a year. Most (28) unions that compensated board members were established before 1962.

Although only 21% of the responding unions gave cash compensation, 46% made non-cash awards (Table 36), but this, too, was less popular with younger unions. The most common awards were certificates, pins, plaques and trophies (Table 37). The large number of unions that gave no awards may have been due partially to the fact that many were so new—45% established in 1963-71 and 14% in 1970-71—that no award system had been developed.

Program Committees (Tables 38-46)

Of the 235 unions that responded to this section, 70 (30%) reported using from one to five committees for programming (Table 38). Fourteen per cent used eight committees, 12% used six committees, 10%—seven committees and 9%—nine committees. One-fourth (56) had 10 or more. The average was seven committees. Predictably, smaller schools had fewer committees. Of the 56 schools that used 10 or more program committees in the union, almost half (24) had more than 10,000 students enrolled. Three unions used an ad-hoc committee. Eight per cent (23) had no program committees. Three-fourths (74% of 186 unions) of the program committees were composed of from one to 10 members (Table 39), and committees tended to be somewhat smaller than those reported in the Bell survey. One-fourth of the program committee chairmen were elected or appointed by the program board or officers (Table 40). Nineteen per cent were elected by committee members, and 17% were appointed or elected by the policy board. This is a sharp departure from the Bell study, in which 43% of the unions appointed chairmen by union policy boards. There is no clear reason for this change unless it can be traced to wording of the question, "How are chairmen selected?". Some respondents indicated method (for example, interview) without indicating the appointing authority.

Many types of program committees were reported by 228 unions (Table 41). The most common types are shown below under general headings:

	Total
Social, Dance	243
Visual Arts, Exhibitions	186
Publicity, Public Relations	165
Special Events	148
Lecture, Forum, Debate	144
Film	136
Games, Tournaments	127
Performing Arts	112

Percentages could not be derived because unions often listed more than one committee in the sub-groups under the functional headings. Generally, however, the above eight types of committees predominated.

Committees concerned with cultural programming were most prevalent (visual arts, lecture-forum-debate and performing arts totaled 442 committees), even over the social and special-events categories combined (391 committees). This accelerated the trend that was evident in the Bell study. Culturally oriented committees might have been even more prevalent than the 1971 survey showed had there not been so many two-year colleges and young unions that either did not have cultural facilities or did not have the time to develop a cultural program by 1971.

Table 41 was broken down into committees established before 1967 and those established after 1967 in order to determine what types of union committees are *now* being established. For the most part the pattern was the same in both periods with the exception of the coffee house and community volunteer service.

A weekly meeting was most prevalent for both individual committees (47%) and all program committees together (42%, Tables 42 and 43). Close to one-fourth (23%) of the individual committees had no regular schedules, compared to 8% of the combined program committees, indicating the total program committees are more structured than the individual groups.

Of the 223 institutions responding, 94% did not compensate their program committee chairmen, regardless of age of the union (Table 44). More than half (58%) of the 218 responding schools gave no awards to program committee members (Table 45), although more (68%) of the post-1962 unions reported no awards than the pre-1962 group (53%)—again probably because the many very recently created unions had not yet developed award systems. The most typical award given to program committee members by the 92 responding institutions was a certificate (49%, Table 46). Others gave plaques (21%) and banquet-parties (12%).

CONCLUSIONS

While many of the responding unions had two-board governments and common characteristics in make-up and function, some had individually styled progam and governing boards. Combined boards appeared to be on the increase since, of the 41 unions that had one board to serve both policy and program functions, 25 were in the younger unions.

The composition of the policy board continued to be representative of the college community—faculty, administration, students and alumni. Student representation remained strong, with representation from student government, faculty, administration and alumni declining since the Bell study. The dominant source of leadership for the policy board was also a student representative. The policy board reported to the institution president and/or governing board more frequently than to any other office or body.

The program board continued to be dominated by the non-paid, volunteer or elected, student. Student government's participation on the program board decreased, while participation of students elected by the general student body increased. Appointment to the program board, however, remained the dominant practice.

A small group of six committees, averaging not more than 10 persons and meeting weekly, provided the majority of programming for the responding unions.

Program committees varied widely, but committees appointed to do cultural programming were more numerous than others. Committees that plan social activities and special events and publicity-public relations committees were the next most frequently listed.

Section III: PROFESSIONAL STAFF

The objectives of this section are to examine the educational and employment backgrounds and the functions—union and non-union—of the union director and his staff. An earlier study by James W. Lyons, *The Union Director and His Job*, dealt only with the director's role; this study includes staff members. For more in-depth study of the union director's position, see the Lyons study; Don L. Phillips's *The Director in Today's College Union;* and the Durrett-Robinson study, *Governance of the College Union.*

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Number of Professional Staff Members Employed by Unions (Table 47)*

Schools with enrollments of fewer than 2,500 had smaller staffs, reflecting their smaller scope of operation. More than half (55%, or 46) of the 86 institutions in this enrollment category listed only one professional staff member. About a quarter (26%, or 22) listed two staff members, and nine (10%) listed three.

At schools with larger enrollments, the union generally was larger and the professional staff increased. Only 18 (27%) of the 66 schools in the 2,500-4,999 enrollment category employed a single staff member. One-fourth (24%) reported two staff members, and 18% listed three. Almost one-third (31%, or 20) listed four or more staff members.

In the 5,000-9,999 enrollment category, 13 (22%) had only one or two staff members. Thirteen (22%) had three staff members. Four and five staff members were listed by 13% and 10%, respectively. Of the 60 unions in this category, one-third employed six or more professional staff members.

---

*A full-time supervisory-managerial staff member or program director, as distingished from clerical and custodial staff

Forty-two (64%) schools in the more-than-10,000 enrollment category employed six or more staff. Only four schools employed one or two staff members.

Many of these unions may have had larger staffs, but the questionnaire asked only for information on the six top staff members. Several deans or assistant deans of student affairs served as directors of the union, especially in schools of fewer than 2,500 students.

Educational Background of Union Directors (Tables 48 and 49)

Union directors reported 24 fields of preparation. This section of the survey aimed to determine trends in academic preparation of union personnel. Of the 274 responses, 14% listed student personnel, and 15% listed guidance and counseling, based on the staff member's most advanced degree. Because preparation in these two fields is often similar, they can be combined for a total of 29% of the directors with student personnel services preparation. There may be a trend toward this type of preparation for directors as opposed to business (15%), the leading field of preparation in 1962. It should be remembered, however, that the results of the current study were heavily influenced by unions opening since 1962 (45%) and that 90 of the unions included in the Bell study did not respond in 1971. Of the 41 directors with business degrees, only 10 had advanced degrees, whereas all 80 in student personnel services had advanced degrees. Five directors (2%) listed college union administration studies as their major field. Other leading fields of preparation for directors were education (8%), school administration (5%), psychology (4%) and physical education (4%).

Schools with fewer than 2,500 students had the highest percentage of directors with advanced degrees, explained largely by the fact that a considerably higher proportion of directors of small unions also had teaching and official student counseling functions (Table 59). The percentage dropped with each enrollment category. The fact that many newer unions were in the lower enrollment groups may indicate that colleges with younger unions are seeking stronger academic preparation in union directors.

Of the 274 respondents, 85 directors (31%) had bachelor's degrees, 171 (62%) had master's degrees, and 15 (5%) had doctorates. Three directors had no degrees, and several had studied beyond the master's degree but had not completed doctorates.

Of the 278 respondents, one-third (34%, or 96) of the directors held faculty rank (Table 48). Forty-three per cent had "academic" rank in the Bell study; however, the current survey asked for "faculty" rank.

Educational Background of Other Staff Members (Table 50)

Other union staff members reported 27 fields of preparation, following a similar pattern of preparation with business (19%), guidance and counseling (9%), student personnel (7%), student personnel services combined (16%), education (10%) and recreation (7%). Thirteen percent had no degrees. Emphasis on business preparation was logical because of the 89 staff members prepared in business, 22 were business managers and 11 were bookstore managers. Student personnel services was the major field of preparation for assistant directors (22%) and program directors (28%). Major fields of preparation for food managers were hotel-restaurant (28%) and home economics (21%).

Thirty-three of 161 assistant directors (20%) held faculty rank, and 29 of 119 program directors (24%) held faculty rank. Few other staff members had faculty status (Table 48).

Union Functions of Staff Members (Tables 51-56)

The questionnaire listed eight union functions to gauge the extent of responsibility held by the union director and his staff.

The union director and assistant director had wide ranges of responsibility. The functions for which directors (Table 51) were most frequently responsible were student program and activities (91%), general building services (87%), operation of recreation (games) facilities (86%), building maintenance (75%) and food service (48%). Directors of unions in the two larger enrollment sizes were more involved in food service (59% and 63%) than directors of smaller unions (40% and 36%). This is no doubt due to the fact that the central-campus food service or contract operator plays a larger role on smaller campuses. In larger unions more directors were concerned with guestroom operations (31%). An increasing number of directors in the smallest enrollment category were involved with guestroom operations (19%), suggesting that more small unions are including guest rooms in their facilities, substantiated by the facility listings in Table 132. Directors on larger campuses had almost twice as much involvement with the physical plant "department" (43% and 55%) than directors of small unions (19% and 27%). However there is no way to interpret the response to this question, which should have read physical plant *development* instead of *department*, which some may have construed to mean *building maintenance* or *repairs*.

Assistant directors (Table 52) were mainly concerned with general building services (73%), student programs and activities (63%), operation of recreation (games) facilities (61%) and building maintenance (57%). Assistant directors of larger unions were more involved with general building services and building maintenance than those of smaller unions.

General building services (82%) and building maintenance (69%) were the primary concerns of administrative assistants (Table 53). Although program directors (Table 54) were primarily concerned with student programs and activities (100%), they were also involved with the operation of recreation (games) facilities (24%). Food managers, naturally, were almost exclusively concerned with food service operation (Table 55).

Functions of night managers varied widely, although their primary concerns were general building services (73%), building maintenance (62%), operation of recreation facilities (62%) and student programs and activities (42%, Table 56).

Line of Responsibility of Union Staff Members (Tables 57 and 58)

Questions about the line of responsibility (line of administrative responsibility as distinguished from receiving direction from a policy board) of the union director established a broad list of relationships. The director was most often "directly responsible" to the student affairs dean, and this relationship increased 15% in the post-1962 unions. All other categories received sparse response. Of these the president and the business manager were most often named.

Some directors were directly responsible to two people, such as the student-affairs dean and the business manager (5%). The influence of the union policy board dropped from 5% in the pre-1962 group to 2% in the post-1962 group, in keeping with Bell's findings.

One can only speculate on what the pattern of administrative responsibility might have been had the 90 other unions responding in the Bell study responded to this survey. For example, 8% of directors of pre-1957 unions and 24% of the 1957-1962 unions reported to the president, 12% and 23% to the business manager and 8% and 2% to the union policy board. The 44% that reported to the student affairs dean in the pre-1957 group decreased to 36% in the 1957-62 group.

Subordinate positions on the union staff showed a consistent pattern of responsibility to the union director in both age groups. The role of the assistant director as a source of authority over others, especially over the program director, should be noted.

Non-Union Function of the Union Director (Table 59)

The union director often finds himself directly concerned with non-union functions and responsibilities because of the union's broad involvement in campus activity and, more particularly, because many institutions, especially smaller ones, have not recognized the need for full-time direction, as the Association recommends. Twenty-seven types of non-union functions were reported by the 162 respondents to this section. Many union directors, especially those of smaller unions, had more than one outside function.

The most prevalent outside responsibilities were student activities coordination (28%), organization advising (17%), campus committee work (15%), special events scheduling-master calendar (14%), general student personnel work (13%) and teaching (12%).The director at smaller schools was assigned these functions much more often than at larger schools, with the exception of organization advising and campus committee work.

Prior Employment Experience (Tables 60-63)

Because of the large increase of college unions, the problem of recruiting staff members has taken on major proportions. This section of the study is aimed at charting prior employment experience and union job turnover.

To determine the stability in union staff positions, "years of employment in present position" was charted (Table 60). Positions of reasonable stability were the bookstore manager (33% held position 11 or more years) and the food manager (26% held position 11 or more years).

In the union director position, 71% held jobs less than five years, with half of these holding jobs less than three years. (It should be noted, once again, that 45% of the unions responding in this study were built in the last nine years with 14% opening only in the year prior to this study.) Fifteen percent, or 38 directors, reported holding positions 11 or more years.

Short-term employment was also evident in the other seven positions, partially for the same reasons as directors. Night managers had the highest turnover rate, with 85% holding jobs only one to two years. Eighty-four percent of the program directors held positions less than five years—62% less than two years. Eighty-three percent of the assistant directors held jobs less than five years—58% less than two years. Forty-three per cent of the administrative assistants and the food-service managers held positions less than two years.

Among the seven positions, night managers, program directors and assistant directors most frequently held positions one to two years, indicating that the highest rate of turnover is in these three positions. A probable explanation for program directors is that they are often younger women, who marry and leave or, if married, have children. Night managers, assistant directors and program directors are also the most logical targets for promotions.

Another area of the study dealt with work experience of union staff members (Table 61). Forty-six directors (17%) had directed unions at other colleges, and 38 of these had held one prior directorship. Forty-two per cent (104) had worked their way up through union ranks; 37 had held subordinate union positions at their present colleges, and 77 had held subordinate union positions at other colleges. However, 41% (109) of the directors had no previous union experience.

Of the other five positions examined, more than half had no prior union experience. Administrative assistants (77%) and program directors (68%) most frequently had no previous union experience.

Ten categories were used to describe the varied work experiences of union staff members prior to their present employment (Table 62). Both education and business were listed regularly in at least six of the seven major staff positions. Directors (52%), assistant directors (42%) and program directors (58%) most frequently had been employed in educational institutions prior to union appointment. The business field was most frequently reported by administrative assistants (40%), bookstore managers (60%) and night managers (33%). Food-service managers, as expected, most frequently had prior work experience in the hotel-restaurant field (86%).

Most staff members had either no prior non-union experience or had held only one other job (Table 63). Four of the seven staff positions reflected one prior non-union position: director, 40%; administrative assistant, 51%; food manager, 52%; and night manager, 68%. The other three staff positions reflected larger percentages having no prior non-union experience: assistant director, 39%, program director, 45%, and bookstore manager 44%.

Conclusions

A major factor in determining the size of the professional staff of a college union is the size of the institution and, hence, the size of the union facility and the scope of its operation. A wide gap exists between the facilities offered and the number of union staffers employed at well-established unions and, on the other hand, smaller unions, which in many cases are fairly new. Larger unions more frequently have intricate organizational structures that include elaborate staffing and extensive delegation of responsibility. A one-man professional staff is generally characteristic [illegible] smaller union, whose organizational structure requires that the union director handle both management and program responsibilities.

The educational preparation of union directors and their staff members continues [illegible] vary widely. Although the Bell study showed the largest percentage [illegible] union administrators were trained in business, student personnel services is now the more frequent field of preparation for directorships (see qualifying remarks in previous discussion). It seems that the educational preparation of union directors is now more directly related to stated union educational goals with more business functions being handled by college business managers in the small colleges and by union business managers in larger schools. Increasingly, the college appears to relate the union to its student-affairs division in terms of the director's line of administrative responsibility, organizational structure and non-union functions of union staff (see qualifying remarks in previous discussion). Most directors come into the union field with work experience in the field of education.

It is not uncommon to find union directors and staff members who have had no previous union experience. Forty-one per cent of the directors had no previous union experience. Of the subordinate staff members, 52-77% had no previous union experience. These percentages show a marked increase in lack of previous union experience since 1962—in spite of the development of many new union training programs (graduate assistantships), union summer short courses and academic course work in union administration. Unions are simply multiplying faster than the supply of union-trained personnel.

Section IV: FINANCIAL OPERATION OF THE UNION

Almost universally the union is expected to be self-supporting—usually aided by an allocation from a general, per capita student fee. This has become increasingly difficult in recent years with inflation, leveling of enrollments, competing demands on student fee income and changing living patterns (such as apartment living, commuting). This section of the study attempts to survey union fee trends and to determine current operating procedures and practices that characterize the union's revenue departments.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Union Fees (Tables 64–70)

A union fee paid by students when they register was still a major means of funding debt service and/or operation (Tables 64 and 65). Three-fourths (77%, or 191) of the schools had student fees—close to the 78% reported in the Bell study. Fees fell into four categories: combined building amortization and operation fees (43%), building amortization fees only (14%), operation fees only (9%) or two fees—separate building amortization and operation fees (8%). Sixty-two schools (22%) had no fees, and 10 schools reported only an activity-program fee (3%). Private institutions were less likely to have a union fee (30%, no fee of any kind) than public schools (19%).

Fees collected by institutions on the semester system are shown in Table 66; those on the quarter system are charted in Table 67. An enrollment breakdown for union fees is in the Appendix, but no significant pattern was found in the amount assessed by schools of different enrollments. The fee, apparently, is more often influenced by such factors as the size of the building in relation to enrollment, the amount of outstanding debt, present or planned construction, the contribution made by revenue-producing departments and the extent of college subsidies.

Most frequently students in semester systems paid $10-15 per semester, or $20-30 per year, and those in quarter systems paid $5-10 per quarter, or $15-30 per year.

The information received on faculty, alumni and life-member categories was insubstantial, indicating that few are fee-paying members.

Seventy-one unions (47% of the 152 established before 1962) reported a fee increase since 1962 (Table 68; the charting of these figures did not include unions established since 1962 as this would be a new fee and not an increase). The range of $5-10 (per semester or quarter) was most prevalent (36%). The number of unions with increases would have been higher had not the rapidly increasing enrollments in the '60s produced higher gross fee incomes, therefore providing a substitute for higher fees.

Thirty-two unions of the total 278 (12%) anticipated an increase in union fees for the 1971-72 academic year (Table 69). The small number expecting increases was greatly influenced by the large number of unions that opened shortly before 1971 and therefore were not yet in need of an increase. A $2-4 increase (per semester or quarter) was most often reported (11 unions). Six unions anticipated a $10-15 increase, and five unions reported a $4-6 increase.

Collecting union fees from undergraduate summer students was reported by 105 schools (38%, Table 70). Again the combined amortization and operation fee was most often named (67 schools, 64%). Twenty-one of these had a $5-7.50 summer fee; 20 had a $2-5 fee. These ranges also predominated the other types of fees.

Union's Revenue-Producing Departments
Food Service (Table 71)

Two-hundred-seventy-one schools reported information on their food service operations. Forty per cent (109 unions) used a contract caterer. Half had enrollments of less than 2,500. The Bell study showed that only three schools (4%) with enrollments of more than 5,000 used institutional caterers, compared with 43 (34%) in this study. (Here again it should be remembered that 90 unions in the Bell study did not report in 1971.) College union management and college dining service were each listed by 28% of the unions, a substantial decrease in unions operating their own food services since the Bell study (42%) but only a slight decrease in operation by the general college dining service (29%) since Bell's study.

Most union's food service operations were entirely self-supporting (77%). Schools with enrollments of 2,500-5,000 and 5,000-10,000 more often had self-supporting operations (85% and 84%, respectively).

More than half (55%) of 213 food service operations contributed profits to the total union operation. One-fourth charged the food service a space rental, and 13% (28 unions) diverted profits elsewhere.

Food purchases were made in 10 ways (Table 71). The institutional caterer was most often the purchaser (37%, or 99 unions). Solely college dining service (21%) and solely college union management (17%) were other leading purchasing agencies. This closely parallels operation of the food service: whoever directs the food service is also the purchaser. The college purchasing department did the purchasing exclusively in 12% of the schools and was involved to some degree in nine per cent.

Bookstore (Table 72)

Facts about bookstore operation were given by 243 unions. More than half of those responding (52%, 124 unions) said the college business office operated the bookstore. Business-office control was more typical in smaller enrollment categories—49% of those with fewer than 2,500 students and 63% of those with between 2,500 and 4,999. Almost one-fourth (24%) of the unions managed stores in their building, compared with 29% in the Bell study. At schools with more than 10,000 enrolled, unions more frequently managed stores in their buildings (34%, or 17 of 50 schools, compared to 36% in 19[illegible]). Other arrangements, such as co-op, auxiliary services and private operation, were reported by 23%.

Most of the bookstore operations (89%, or 133 of 149 respondents) were self-supporting. Most subsidized bookstores (19%) were found in schools with fewer than 2,500 enrolled.

Of the 189 schools providing information on profit disposition policy, one-third (63) earmarked part of the bookstore earnings for the union. Twenty-nine contributed 76-100% of their profits; 10 of these served an enrollment of more than 10,000. Another 66 schools (35%) diverted bookstore profits to departments other than the union. Sixty (32%) paid union rent. One-third of these were in the more-than-10,000 enrollment category.

Guest Rooms (Table 73)

About one-fifth of the unions had guest rooms. Of the 54 schools responding, 37 (68%) said their union guest rooms were operated by the union. The largest schools (17) operated their own guest units; whereas in the three smaller size categories, 40% or more of the guest units were operated by other agencies, usually the college housing office. However, this question was ambiguous and could have been interpreted to concern guest units anywhere on the campus.

Unlike the other revenue departments, guest rooms were divided three-to-two between self-supporting (18 schools) and subsidized (13) schools).

Concessions (Tables 74–78)

Twenty-three types of concessions were reported by 267 respondents. The inquiries were arranged in terms of methods of operation and handling of profits.

Concessions most often named were vending machines (100%), juke boxes (81%), telephones (74%), pinball machines (69%), copy machines (50%), vending machines elsewhere on campus (42%) and barber shops (35%).

Vending machines and juke boxes were most frequently operated on a commission basis (73% and 71%, respectively). Almost a fourth of the vending machines (22%) and juke boxes (23%) were operated by the union. Telephones (67%) and pinball machines (60%) were operated on a commission basis, with 16% of the telephones on a space-rental basis and 37% of the pinball machines operated by the union. Copy machines were most often (56%) operated by the union—21% on a commission basis and 23% on a space-rental basis.

Vending machines elsewhere on campus were most often operated on a commission basis (66%). Twenty-eight per cent were operated by the union.

Barber shops were most frequently operated on a space-rental basis (46%), 31% on a commission basis and 23% by the union.

The majority of concessions contributed profits to the total union operation. A few concessions divided profits between the union and other agencies.

An enrollment breakdown for all concession results is in the Appendix.

Other Revenue Departments (Tables 79–83)

The study dealt with 16 "other" types of revenue-producing departments. The results are shown in terms of "self-supporting" or "subsidized" and handling of profits.

Of the categories with the highest number of responses, games, general services/merchandise desk, hall rentals, recreation equipment, movies and programs were generally self-supporting, although movies and programs were more often subsidized. Programs and movies were subsidized in 81% and 54%, respectively, of the unions. Movies were self-supporting in 46% of the unions.

Programs were self-supporting in 19%. Games and general services/merchandise desk were self-supporting in 80% and 67%, respectively, of the unions.

Profits from these revenue-producing departments were usually returned to the total union operation.

An enrollment breakdown for the 16 revenue-producing departments is in the Appendix.

Conclusions

The union-fee data showed that a combined building amortization and operating fee was used most frequently. One-hundred-twenty schools (43%) had a combined fee compared with 39 (14%) with only a building amortization fee and 25 (9%) with only an operating fee. It is revealing that 19% of the unions at public institutions and 30% at private institutions had no union fee, suggesting that a substantial number of unions are supported only by a combination of dining and/or bookstore receipts and direct appropriations from college funds. (No similar data were shown in the Bell study.) A number of unions may have opened, or were about to open, in 1970-72 and had not yet decided on a fee.

Union fees are still rising rapidly, both in keeping with the inflationary period and because many younger unions borrowed more heavily than older unions (often at higher interest rates). Forty-six per cent of the pre-1962 schools had increased their fees since 1962, and 12% more (pre-1962 and post-1962 unions combined) anticipated an increase during the 1971-72 academic year. No longer are increased enrollments producing the necessary income support needed to operate the facilities and pay off amortization obligations, as shown in the Bell study when only 25 of 180 unions (14%) had increased their fees during the previous six years.

It is difficult to determine closely how much students pay in union fees because of the $5 intervals used in summarized results (as in the Bell study, which the current study repeated for comparison purposes) and because the Bell study reported only semester fees, while the current study shows both semester and quarterly fees. It can be said that students in semester systems most often pay $10-15 per semester ($20-30 per year) compared with $5-10 per semester in the Bell study ($10-20 per year). Students in quarter systems most often pay $5-10 per quarter ($15-30 per year for a three-quarter year).

The study showed continued evidence of the union's reliance on revenue-producing operations. Only movies and programs were more frequently *not* self-supporting. (However, some respondents possibly did not notice that the survey asked for results of only *revenue-producing* movies and programs. Any blending of free movies and programs with those where admission is charged would, of course, tend to show such operations as *not* self-supporting.) In comparison with the Bell study, fewer business operations were self-supporting in 1971. For example, in

1962, 87% of food-service operations and 94% of the bookstores were self-supporting, compared with 77% and 89%, respectively, in 1971. This may be another illustration of union operating difficulties and the need for higher student fees.

Many unions, including some of the larger ones, said they used non-union agencies—institutional contract caterers, the college general-dining services and the business offices—for managerial assistance in the major revenue-producing departments (such as food service, bookstore).

Section V: GENERAL UNION POLICIES

Because what a union does and how it does it can have important consequences for its total campus population, union policymaking becomes a factor of considerable significance. The purpose of this section is to review procedural trends in such areas as business-management policies, program and program financing and in the handling of office space, maintenance and miscellaneous services. The primary objective is to determine the degree of involvement of the union itself in the establishment of policies in these areas.

Most tabulations in this section were done in terms of all schools, enrollment sizes and ages of the unions. The latter consideration, like Bell's, intends to draw comparisons between policy trends of very recent years, involving newly established unions, and the period before the Bell study. Furthermore, this study differentiated public and private institutions to provide another means of comparing union operational trends.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Business Matters (Tables 84–97)

Half (49%) the unions continue to establish policy on *general business matters* (Table 84) via a coordinated union-business office effort. General business policy was established by union staff alone in one-fourth (24%) of the unions and by the business office alone in 15% of the unions. The union policy board had sole jurisdiction in only 4% of the unions. As the size of the school increased, so did the ratio of unions at which the staff alone made general business policy determinations—16% in the fewer-than-2,500 category compared with a third of those with more than 10,000 enrolled. In unions established after 1962, the trend was toward more policy making by the business office (19% compared with 12% in pre-1962 unions) and less by union staffs (19% compared with

29% in pre-1962 unions). However, joint policy-making with the business office was by far the most common practice (50% of unions established after 1962, 47% of pre-1962 unions). Union-business office policy-making was the dominant method in private schools (59%), regardless of age of the union.

Policy regarding *purchasing procedures* (Table 85) was also established most often by a coordinated union-business office effort (42%); but in almost as many schools (38%), only the business office determined purchasing policy. More business offices and fewer union staffs set purchasing policy for post-1962 unions than for pre-1962 unions. In public institutions, business offices alone slightly more often established purchasing procedures (39%) than in cooperation with unions (37%). On the other hand, more than half (53%) of the private schools used the coordinated union-business office approach, and 37% used the business office only. Systemwide state policies giving purchasing responsibility to the business office may explain the variance between public and private institutions.

A continued trend toward a coordinated union-business office approach was demonstrated in the area of setting policy with regard to the union's *profit goals* (Table 86). The joint approach was used almost twice as often as the union staff alone (39%, compared with 21%). Furthermore, 44% of post-1962 unions used the joint approach, compared with 15% relying on union staff alone. This supports Bell's findings on the decline of the union staff-only method although again it should be noted that the larger the school, the greater the involvement of the union staff. Half the private schools used the joint approach, but 20% used only the business office, compared with 12% using union staff only. Public schools (and the older unions) relied much more often on the union staff (26%) and less often on the business office (9%). The union policy board continued to become less influential, 10% setting profit policy among the older unions, compared with 6% among the newer ones.

As noted earlier, many of the older, larger unions were not represented in these findings, while a considerably higher proportion of very new unions (than in the Bell study) and especially two-year college unions, where college management and policy-making by the college itself prevails *were* represented.

Policy on *food prices* (Table 87) was most often established by the business office (26%), the joint union-business office (21%) and the union staff (17%). An interesting contrast is that the two smaller enrollment groups looked to the business office (36% and 38%, respectively) and very few to the union staff, while the two larger enrollment groups (20% and 33%, respectively) indicated the union staff made price decisions (compared with 8% and 14% indicating the business office). Also, in older unions, union staff was the leading decision-maker (25%), followed by the joint approach (21%) and the business office (19%), while in post-1962 unions, the business office was the principal policymaker (33%), followed by the joint approach (20%) and union staff (7%). Private schools particularly looked to the business office (46%). This is explained largely by the fact that many newer unions and private schools are small, hence the food service is either handled by a commercial caterer or is part of a campuswide food service, with the union staff having little to do with either. Therefore, pricing policy becomes the function of the business office.

The business office most often (44%) set *bookstore prices.* All four enrollment categories showed the business office was the predominant policy-maker, which differs from Bell's study, in which larger schools indicated the union staff was the decision-maker. Here again the principal explanation is that many stores operated independently of the union, with no management involvement of the union staff. A fifth of the institutions reported prices were set by the "other" category, often indicating publishers set prices.

Setting policy on reserve for *repair and replacement* (Table 89) was still principally handled jointly by the union and business office (37%). However, the business office has become more of a factor in recent years, as it was listed as the decision-maker in 39% of the post-1962 institutions, compared with 17% of the pre-1962 group—again influenced by the large number of two-year and other very new unions in the post-1962 group. The joint approach was indicated by 41% of the pre-1962 and 32% of the post-1962 unions.

A third (34%) of the schools indicated the business office established policy on *employee wage levels* (Table 90), and 28% said the union and business office decided levels jointly. The smaller the enrollment, the more this trend prevailed, while the larger the school, especially public, the more the university governing board or state government wage policies determined wage levels—ranging from 9% of schools with fewer than 2,500 enrolled to 34% with more than 10,000 enrolled (10% for private schools and 29% for public).

Policy concerning *employee benefits* (Table 91) was established largely by the business office (47%). The union staff and business office jointly established policy in 19% of the schools, university governing board in 13% and state government in 12%. Private schools again showed strong reliance on the business office (67%), although a fifth used the coordinated union-business office approach. The "other" category (12%) usually referred to state or private-school retirement plans and showed no preponderant age.

The university governing board (27%) and the business office (24%) were fairly close in establishing policy on *student fees* (Table 92). The tabulations approximated Bell's findings. Small schools (fewer than 2,500) again relied chiefly on the business office (34%), and larger schools (more than 10,000) relied most heavily on the university governing board

(38%). Also, newer unions reported more instances of fee decisions by the business office (28%) when compared with the pre-1962 group (20%). And private schools most often looked to the business office (38%); public schools most often relied on the university governing board (19%). The union policy board was involved in only 11% of the cases.

The main policy-setting sources for *reserve fund deposits* (Table 93) remained the business office (43%) and union staff and business office combined (21%). However, use of the business office as a policy-maker increased, and the joint approach decreased. The business office role was especially noticeable in post-1962 unions (48%) and the fewer-than-2,500 enrollment schools (58%). The business office is the policy-maker in two-thirds of the private schools in contrast to one-third of the public schools. The union staff alone played a relatively minor part throughout (5%).

In sharp contrast to all the above areas of policy-making, in matters of *building use* (Table 94) the union policy board was the main decision-maker (35%), with the union staff second (21%). In addition, 14% reported policy-making by the union staff and union policy board jointly. Once again newer unions (31%) displayed less frequent use of policy boards than older unions (40%) and somewhat increased dependence on the union staff. Private schools particularly (36%) reported the staff made building-use decisions, compared with 14% of the public schools.

Some differences from the Bell survey are evident in *program policy establishment* (Table 95). Although the union policy board declined in significance in newer unions, it (33%) generally replaced the union staff (19%) as the leading source of policy determination, while a combination of union staff and policy board was indicated by 14% of the schools. The union policy board prevailed in the two larger enrollment groups (35% and 45%) over use of union staff (12% and 10%), but in private colleges, curiously, union staff (33%) more frequently made policy than did the policy board (28%). However, growing student involvement and decision-making regarding programs was the trend and was also evident in the 7% that checked "other," meaning, for example, student program boards and student government.

In determining policy on *building development plans* (Table 96), a leading number of institutions (29%) reported use of the coordinated union-business office approach. Not so common in building-development planning were the university governing board (10%), union policy board (10%) and the combination of union staff and policy board (10%). As in Bell's study, the two smaller groups of schools, especially, made use of the joint union-business office approach (43% of the fewer-than-2,500 enrollment group and 31% of the 2,500–5,000 group). The newer post-1962 institutions also displayed a decrease in use of union staff (5%), policy boards (6%) and staff and policy board combined (11%). It should be remembered that the post-1962 group includes 33 two-year colleges, many of which do not have policy boards or union staff members concerned with facilities other than those for programming.

On making policy for the *disposition of operating surpluses* (Table 97), the coordinated union-business office approach led with 29%. An increase in the role of the business office alone was indicated (24%), in comparison with the Bell survey (16%)—especially in the case of the fewer-than-2,500 schools (39% in this study compared with 19% in the Bell findings), and in the post-1962 group (30% compared with 15% of the newer unions in the Bell study)—and the pre-1962 group of this study (19%). Again, the relatively high proportion of two-year colleges in the post-1962 group and in the smaller enrollment category is a principal explanation of the increase since union staff and policy boards (where they exist) at two-year colleges are not much involved in policy-making in any area except program.

Program Matters (Tables 98-105)

Eighty-two per cent of the institutions reported they used other college facilities to supplement union facilities (Table 98). Only 17% confined their programming to union facilities. This is a sharp departure from Bell's findings, which showed 39% of all unions holding programs entirely within their own facilities, and is probably a reflection of many unions' entering the pop-concert and film-showing fields since 1962 (and not having a suitable auditorium of their own). Table 99 shows union programming in a gym or field house (54%), auditorium (48%) and theater (16%). The influence of expanding outing programs is noticeable in the use of college-owned recreation areas (13%) and non-college recreation facilities (10%).

Most schools (88%) indicated programs were *planned and executed* (Table 100) by coordinated efforts of the program board, committees and staff (compared with 82% in the Bell survey). Bell's study indicated that the larger the school, the more it used this coordinated approach. This study confirmed the trend, although much less disparity existed between small and large schools. Three per cent had no planned program, compared with 6% in the Bell study, and all were not small schools as in 1962. It would appear that a somewhat larger proportion of unions are now engaged in programming and that students are more actively involved.

All members of the college community (89%) were found to be served by union programs; only 11% provided their programs for students only. Eighteen per cent of the respondents reported their programs also served townspeople, compared with 12% in the Bell survey (Table 101).

Response to questions concerning costs of free union programming (Table 102) was fairly complete. These costs were intended to exclude salaries, building service costs and clerical time and to include only out-of-pocket expense. Data from the 218 responding schools showed that 92% provided more than $3,000 a year for free programs; Bell reported 82%. Two-thirds (67%) of the total number recorded expenditures of more than $10,000 per year; Bell showed only 40% expending this much. A further breakdown in this study shows 38% spent $10,000-30,000, 16% spent $30,000-50,000 and 15% spent more than $50,000. As was evidenced in the Bell study, the larger expenditures (in this case more than $50,000) were found at unions at the larger schools, although 5% of the fewer-than-2,500-enrollment schools and 13% of the 2,500-4,999 schools also showed expenditures of more than $50,000. This may be due to a tendency, despite the instructions, to include wage and other indirect costs. But possibly, and more likely, the smaller schools simply included the proceeds from a general student activity fee that included free publications and free admission to athletic and cultural events. Inflation partly accounts for the steep rise in program costs since 1962.

Seventeen per cent of the respondents spent less than $1 per full-time day student on union programming (Table 103), compared with 34% spending that sum in 1962. Eighteen per cent spent $1-1.99 per student; 29% spent $2-4.99; 16% spent $5-5.99; 14% spent $10-20; and 6% spent more than $50 per student. As expected, smaller schools appeared to spend more money per student. But it seems unlikely that 15% of the fewer-than-2,500 enrollment group would spend more than $20 per student on free union programs, as the table shows, unless personnel and other expenses were also included.

The response on profit and loss trends for union revenue-producing programs (Tables 104 and 105) included only 61% of the schools (170 union). This smaller percentage (also true in the Bell study) might indicate that many unions do not have revenue-producing events or programs and possibly that others do not maintain separate record-keeping on such programs. Of the 51 unions (18%) indicating an operating surplus, 67% reported a surplus of up to $5,000; while of the 119 unions (43%) reporting deficits, 31% had deficits of up to $5,000 and 69% had deficits of more than $5,000 (23% had more than $20,000 deficits). It seems to indicate that union revenue producing programs (for example, pop concerts, dances and films, where admission is charged) are anything but profitable.

Office Space Practices (Tables 106-112)

Findings were much the same as Bell's for permanent office space leasing (Table 106). Of the 112 responses, half (48%) provided space for up to three organizations, while 31% provided for four to six organizations.

Ninety-two unions assigned student-organization office space under terms of annual review and renewal (Table 107). The permanent lease arrangement was preferred to annual review and renewal but declined as a practice and did not maintain the 8-to-5 ratio as in the Bell study. The ratio is now about 6-to-5, indicating a trend away from long-term office commitments, especially where more than six organizations are housed. In Table 108, "Student Organization Office Space for Special Activities Assigned for Short-term Use," only 36 unions responded—53% of these accommodated up to three organizations and 22% from four to six groups.

The overall response to the union's providing equipment for organizational offices (Table 109) resembled Bell's results. Of 234 shcools, half reported limited provision of office equipment, 27% provided all office equipment and 27% provided no equipment.

A study of office-space maintenance for organizations (Table 110) showed that 94% of the unions provided normal maintenance, and the remainder provided none. These percentages (from 230 schools) again were almost exactly the same as in Bell's findings.

A few unions charged rental fees from student organizations (Table 111). Of only 37 responses (13%), student government and clubs and organizations were most often charged; 43% of the 37 unions charged rent in each case. Only 22% charged student publications.

Only 33 schools (12%) said they charged a rental fee from administrative departments (Table 112). Sixty-eight schools responded to this question in Bell's study, but again, only 12% of them charged rent.

Building Maintenance (Tables 113–117)

A significant trend became evident regarding responsibility for union maintenance staff. Bell's study indicated the maintenance staff was primarily responsible to union management in 62% of the unions. But the current study showed the staff responsible to the university maintenance department (53%). The smaller the school, the more often this was true. The two smaller enrollment groups reported responsibility to the maintenance department in 74% and 62% of the cases, while the two larger enrollment groups specified union management (52% and 78%). This outcome resulted partially from the fact that larger unions are better staffed to supervise maintenance and partially from the fact that newer unions and two-year colleges are generally in the smaller enrollment brackets, where the colleges assume a more active role in the management of the union. Note that 63% of the post-1962 unions looked to maintenance-department supervision compared with 44% of the pre-1962 unions.

More than half (52%) of union maintenance staff salaries (Table 114) continued to be charged to the union management, although they had decreased from Bell's 57%. In almost half (48%) the unions, maintenance salaries were paid either by the maintenance department or the general college budget. The fewer-than-2,500-enrollment group financed maintenance most often through the general university budget (36%) or the maintenance department (30%)—total of 66%—rather than the union (26%). Another change to note is how the general university budget increasingly financed maintenance-staff salaries in newer unions—32% in the post-1962 group compared with 17% in the pre-1962 group—and accordingly decreased the burden on union budgets by 15 percentage points. This probably represents growing recognition of the problem of paying all costs at the union while still keeping the student fee and student prices at an acceptable level and/or recognition of the inequity of having students pay for maintenance on a building used by the entire college community.

Data on financing union maintenance supplies (Table 115) showed the union was once again the agency that most often paid for them (58%). However, this responsibility had decreased substantially from Bell's 69%. As with salaries, aid from the college maintenance department increased as the size of the school decreased. Only 39% of the fewer-than-2,500-enrollment group paid for supplies compared with 83% of the more-than-10,000 group. The reasons are undoubtedly much the same as described for salary expense (see above).

This study found, as did Bell's, that financing union-building repairs (Table 116) was covered by two-thirds of the unions—down from Bell's three-fourths. Only 58% of the post-1962 unions paid for repairs, compared with 72% of the pre-1962 unions. Again, as schools decreased in size, the tendency was to rely on the university maintenance department to cover the cost of repairs (45% of the fewer-than-2,500 group compared with 19% of the more-than-10,000 group).

Building engineers (34%) and mechanics (28%) were the most frequently used specialized, full-time, union-maintenance personnel (Table 117). As Bell also indicated, these types of personnel are found mainly in larger union operations, which require specialists continuously. The smaller unions rely on their college maintenance departments, as they do for maintenance service generally. (The general laborer category was not included in this survey due to the non-specialized nature of the position.)

Miscellaneous Services of the Union (Tables 118–119)

The list of miscellaneous services (Table 118) was expanded to 30 items from Bell's list of 12. The order of the first three repeated Bell's findings: bulletin board space (100%), lost-and-found department (94%) and ticket sales (92%). Additional high tallies were recorded under general campus information (91%), personal-notices board (80%), master calendar of campus events (75%), travel board (75%), mail boxes for student organizations (74%) and sign- and poster-making (70%). The growth of additional listings on this table points out the growing number of miscellaneous services handled by unions and is worth consulting by unions that are interested in learning what services appeal to a substantial number of students.

The list of types of equipment loaned for outside use (Table 119) also expanded. Tables and chairs were loaned most often (62% and 57%), as Bell also found. In addition, public-address equipment was loaned by half (51%) the unions and recreation equipment by 44%. Other equipment was loaned to a lesser degree. Misunderstanding may have occurred regarding this table. Many may have misread or overlooked the emphasis on equipment loaned *outside* the union building, inasmuch as very few charged for equipment loans. Free use outside the building seems unlikely considering the costs of labor involved in moving the equipment, wear and tear, and the frequent demands for equipment elsewhere (if free), which could strip the union of equipment needed for its own services within the building.

Conclusions

A rereading of the introduction to this study describing the limitations of the representativeness of the survey sample is suggested as an aid to appraising the findings in this section. As noted, we are dealing with what less than a third of the unions on the Association mailing list say and do—not what *most* say and do—and the data, in contrast to earlier surveys, is strongly weighted toward two-year colleges and toward very new unions, a number of which have not yet developed policies or practices or arrived at the ones by which they will later live. Nevertheless, keeping this qualification in mind, some trends have emerged.

While the coordinated approach by the business office and the union staff in making business policies continued to predominate in many areas, there were strong indications of more business-office decision-making and less involvement of the union staff and union policy board, especially at newer unions and smaller schools. In short, it would appear that in these two situations the union is more college-managed than it is union-managed. Generally, the larger the school, the greater involvement of the union staff; but taking all unions together, the business office (or sometimes the college governing board) most frequently established food prices, bookstore prices, wage levels, employee benefits, student fees and reserve fund deposits.

In an era when students are demanding a part in college policy-making in almost all areas, the union policy board, ironically, finds itself little involved in union policy-making—except building use and programming. Here it is the dominant factor, with the role of the union staff declining since the Bell survey.

The majority of unions used additional college facilities for programming—mainly auditoriums, gymnasiums and recreation areas—a decidedly new phenomenon. Programs were planned and executed by a coordinated staff, program board and committee effort, and generally they served all members of the college community—also new developments. Free union program costs have increased spectacularly. Thirty-eight per cent spent between $10,000 and $30,000, and 15% spent more than $50,000. Smaller schools, as expected, spent more per student—15% reported more than $20 per student (which seems unlikely). Union revenue-producing programs typically were reported as producing a surplus, if any, of $500-5,000. Most showed deficits ranging from $5,000 to more than $20,000.

Office space was usually provided to student organizations on a permanent basis, but this practice was declining in favor of annual review and renewal. Most unions supplied some or all office equipment and maintenance. Very few unions charged for office-space use, and rental fees for college administrative offices were infrequent.

Payment for union maintenance supplies, repairs and salaries still came from union monies in most instances, but since the Bell study, these costs have shifted noticeably to the maintenance department or general college budget at schools of all sizes.

Most of the small schools relied on the college maintenance department for specialized maintenance services. Unions at larger schools had their own specialized maintenance personnel.

Principal miscellaneous services tended to be informational, such as bulletin-board space, lost and found, general campus information and personal-notices board. The number and kinds of services were increasing greatly.

A significant difference was indicated in the amount of equipment loaned for use outside the union and the charges for such loans. The question may well have been misread because it seems highly unlikely that such valuable equipment would be loaned for no charge.

Section VI: RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS

To what extent do union operations cooperate or assist with functions offered by other college departments? This section attempts to provide insight into this matter, as well as to look at functions that may supplement or duplicate existing union services.

It is important that campus agencies cooperate so that the best possible facilities, programs and services can be offered. Information from this section, although limited, may contribute to this spirit of cooperation and enhance the union's role.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

*General Campus Activities—Non-Union**
(Tables 120–122)

As in Bell's study, this section attempted to determine practices regarding facilities, management and programs. Some problems encountered by Bell reoccurred. The nature of this part of the questionnaire was too vague, and misinterpretations, leading to overlapping responses, were evident.

The first area concerned *facilities used for non-union campus activities* (Table 120). Four-fifths of the respondents said the headquarters for the general activities program was in the union, while only one-fifth said a separate building was used. This was characteristic of schools of all sizes. One-hundred-nineteen schools indicated they used a combination of campus facilities, including the union building, in addition to reporting that they housed the headquarters for general activities in the union. Bell's study found similar results in these areas (83% and 17%); here, too, overlapping responses occurred.

---

*Usually called "Student Activities"

Responses regarding management responsibility for non-union activities (Table 121) varied substantially from Bell's findings. The union director doubled as head of student activities in two-thirds (65%) of the schools, whereas non-union personnel were responsible in more than one-third (35%) of the schools. Bell found that the union director doubled in only 52% of the responding schools. This is a reflection of the sharply increased tendency in small schools to assign responsibility for non-union activities to the union director (86%, compared with 62% in the Bell survey). However, there is also evidence of this tendency at the largest schools—at least those responding in this study. Another question concerned combined responsibility of union and non-union personnel. One-hundred-seven unions (almost 40%) said they used this combination, with the union director supervising some general, non-union activities and other college personnel assuming responsibility for the remainder.

Thirty-nine per cent said non-union activities were programmed (Table 122) independently of the union, and 61% correlated non-union activities with union programs. This differs from Bell's findings, in which these methods were used about equally (49% and 50%). Small schools (78%) again leaned toward a system correlated with the union program although much more so than in the Bell study (58%), and the 5,000-plus schools, as before, were slanted toward the independently conducted non-union programs. The intent of Table 122 was also to identify schools at which the union program was part of a general, centrally administered campus activity program, but misinterpretations and an overlapping of answers made it impossible to measure the responses to this question meaningfully.

Student Government (Table 123)

Even though some double responses did occur in this section, trends were illuminated regarding the relationship of union and student government. Bell found 55% of the responding unions operated independently of student government, while this study showed 61% operated independently. One-hundred-forty-two schools said that while the union operated independently, it maintained a close liaison with student government.

Sixty-two schools (39%) said the union was an agency of student government, compared with 45% in the Bell survey. This study revealed, as did Bell's, that only the smaller schools structered the union as part of student government; more than 80% of the larger schools reported independent union operation.

Adult Education (Tables 124–127)

A significant change is noted regarding facilities for adult-education programs (Table 124). Bell reported 66% of 144 schools used a combination of campus facilities, including the union. This survey showed only 17% of 221 schools used this approach. The union itself became the primary headquarters for adult-education programs (65%, compared with 17% in the Bell survey), indicating, perhaps, there were better facilities for adult conferences in the newer unions. The percentage of separate adult-education centers in both surveys remains about 18%.

As in the Bell study, schools reported that non-union personnel were usually responsible for campus adult-education programs (Table 125). Seventy-nine per cent of 189 schools reported non-union staff responsibility compared with 82% of 107 schools in the Bell study. A combination of union and non-union administration increased from 12% to 16%.

The two studies also showed similar results regarding *special services* (Table 126), such as registration, clerical and information, for adult-education programs. Eighty-four per cent of 207 schools reported special services were handled by a separate adult-education administration or other campus department, and 16% said the union handled them. Bell cited 80% and 20%, respectively, from among 137 schools.

Information and registration, as in the Bell study, were most often provided. It appears that the majority of unions still offer their physical facilities and general services to adult education programs, although an adult-education agency usually organizes and administers the program.

In the 220 institutions that answered the question about *union facilities used for campus adult-education programs* (Table 127), the following facilities were used most frequently: meeting rooms (100%), lounges (97%), snack bar (88%), games area (86%), auditorium (84%), cafeteria (77%), banqueting facilities (77%) and ballroom (63%). Again, as in the Bell study, charges for the use of facilities were not applied by more than 28% of the unions for any given facility since the costs were absorbed by the institutions. As might be expected, use of the ballroom most often required a fee (28%).

Business Office (Table 128)

The purpose of this section was to determine union responsibility for procedures in relation to the college business office. The results again demonstrated a close working relationship between the two operations. Twenty-two per cent of 236 institutions indicated they operated independently of the college business office, while 13% indicated independence in the Bell study.

More than four-fifths of all unions submitted a variety of records to the business office (which makes suspect the statement by 22% that they operated independently of the business office). Curiously, however, only 45% prepared periodic financial operating statements for the business office, and only 51% submitted annual reports of financial operations. Apparently the business office itself prepared these.

Conclusions

Many of the trends in this section emphasized cooperation between the union and other college departments, confirming Bell's study.

A good example of union involvement with others involved programming, management and providing facilities for campus activities. Furthermore, the unions maintained close liaisons with student governments. However, as Bell found, unions at larger institutions were more specialized and operated more independently. Small-school unions were much more involved in the general campus activities program, in student government and in providing facilities for adult education.

Generally, it appears the union has become the principal center for adult-education programs, in sharp contrast to the situation in 1962.

As other sections in this survey indicated, the college business office plays a vital part in the union operation. This section underscored such a trend. In almost all financial matters, 80-100% of the unions reported to, or otherwise worked through, the business office. Where reporting was not done alone, presumably either the business office kept the records or prepared the reports itself or certain kinds of record keeping were not done.

Overlapping in some responses to this section may have made findings less valid, but the overall results were fairly conclusive, showing continued trends that agree, in the main, with many of those found in Bell's study. Changing the structure of some questions and tables would improve this section.

Section VII: FACILITIES

This section deals with building facilities in the union operation and is more extensive than Bell's version. Bell's section on facilities comprised eight categories covering 78 facilities, whereas this study comprises 10 categories and 132 facilities. As did the previous instrument, this study sought to determine the patterns of facilities in relation to institution enrollments, age of unions and types of schools. Also, information was developed to ascertain in some unions specific facilities data, such as room sizes, capacities and charges for use.

Information derived from the original questionnaire, in addition to the supplement, provides interesting comparisons with Bell's work. Also important is that this expanded section presents a more complete picture of trends and development of union building facilities. But again it should be remembered that the results of this survey are often conditioned by the much higher proportion of two-year-college unions than in Bell's (two-year-college buildings generally being smaller and much more limited in facilities) and by the fact that one-half of the older, larger unions that responded to Bell's survey did not respond in this survey.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Recreation Facilities (Tables 129–140)

A higher percentage of *billiard rooms*, 91% of 278 unions, was indicated in this study (Table 129) than the 79% of 180 unions reported in Bell's findings. Schools with fewer-than-2,500 students were slightly less likely to have billiard rooms when compared with larger schools (88% of the small schools had them compared with 91% of schools in general). However, more small schools had billiard rooms in 1971 (88%) than in 1962 (66%). The other enrollment categories, as in Bell's study, equaled or topped the average. An increase in billiard facilities was seen in the more recently established unions. Eighty-eight per cent of the unions built before 1962 had billiard facilities, whereas 95% of those established in the past 10 years housed billiards facilities. In the Bell study, these figures were reversed—82% of those before 1957 and 76% of the newer ones.

Smaller schools usually (67%) provided 3-6 billiard tables (Table 130), an increase from Bell's 50%. Half the 2,500-4,999 group provided 3-6 tables. The table groupings (3-6, 7-10, 11-15) were fairly evenly distributed in the 5,000-9,999 bracket, which included 79% of the respondents, whereas Bell found that most schools in this enrollment group (36%) used 7-10 tables. Also, the former study found that most schools with more-than-10,000 students provided 11-15 tables (42%); the present study indicates they used 16-20 tables (30%).

Nine per cent of the responding 254 unions reported they did not charge for billiards, a decrease from Bell's 13%. Bell indicated that more than half (53%) who charged, charged 60¢ per hour, and that a fourth charged 61¢ to $1 per hour. In this study, 60¢ per hour was most prevalent among a varied representation of rates, being charged by 21% of the schools. However, almost an equal number, 20%, charged 91¢ to $1 per hour (Table 131).

Table tennis (Table 129) facilities were provided by 79% of the 278 respondents, indicating it was not as popular as billiards. Conversely, Bell found more table-tennis facilities than billiards facilities. Rural schools registered a figure roughly comparable to urban and suburban schools—down from the 100% of the prior study. Both studies showed more table-tennis facilities at recently established unions than at older ones—90% to 70% in this report and 86% to 79% in Bell's.

Although some variation occurred regarding the number of table-tennis tables (Table 132), the majority of unions maintained from one to six tables. Schools with fewer-than-2,500 enrolled still generally provided 1-2 tables (66%), and 2,500-4,999 schools maintained 3-6 tables (51%). But half (51%) the 5,000-9,999 schools had 1-2 tables instead of 3-6 tables as Bell reported. The more-than-10,000 schools moved from 1-2 tables (43%) to 3-6 tables (66%).

Half the schools (49%, or 103) reported a no-charge policy for table tennis, whereas the earlier study showed 39% (59 schools) not charging. Among schools that charged, the per-hour basis was again more prevalent than a no-time-limit system. Forty-one per cent charged 41-60¢ per hour, 27% charged 26-40¢ and 19% 11-25¢ per hour. The trend seemed to be toward not charging for table tennis but toward higher rates per hour when a union did charge.

Forty-two per cent of the 278 unions operated *bowling* facilities (Table 129), which confirmed Bell's report. However, a breakdown of enrollments indicated changes (although the fewer-than-2,500 schools still were low at 17%). The more-than-10,000 group most frequently had bowling facilities (67%), replacing the former leader, the 5,000-9,999 group, which had 57% in this study, down from 60% in the Bell study. An interesting point is that fewer of the newer schools (30%) had bowling facilities than the before-1962 unions (51%), which reflects the declining student interest in bowling (which started in the mid-1960s) and/or the recent decisions to postpone bowling until the construction of an addition.

The enrollment breakdown (Table 134), which otherwise generally agreed with Bell's study, showed that of those unions that had bowling, most of the fewer-than-2,500 schools provided 4-6 lanes (80%); the 2,500-4,999 schools provided 4-10 lanes (95%); the more-than-10,000 schools provided 16-25 lanes (45%); and the 5,000-9,999 schools differed from Bell's study in providing 4-10 lanes (72%) instead of the previous 11-15 lanes (34%).

Nearly all the 116 schools (99%) used automatic pinsetters (an increase of 5% since 1962), while union ownership expanded from 71% to 81% (Tables 135, 136). The ratio of owning to leasing, 81% to 19%, remained the same in the union-age breakdown, where Bell found that ownership was slightly more common among more recent unions.

Although rates per line had increased (Tables 137-138), they were still below commercial rates. Prices for open bowling ranged from 35¢ to 50¢ per line, with 40¢ being most popular, while league charges were 35¢ or 40¢ per line. Bell found 30-35¢ per line to be most prevalent for both open and league bowling. Outside groups and students were generally charged the same. Physical-education classes, which showed more strength in the charge-per-term table, were indicated by only 24 schools; per-line charges generally ranged 25-40¢. An interesting addition to this study showed 109 institutions used per-line charges (Table 137)—93% of the unions with bowling facilities. Only nine institutions, fewer than in Bell's study, charged per hour, with $1-1.99 being the most frequent charge. Forty-nine schools, (42%) had a special per-student-per-term charge for physical-education classes (Table 139). The rates varied from $5 to $15 per term, although $6-10 was most frequent, as it was in Bell's study. (The rather wide spread in charges is due partially to whether the term was semester or quarter.)

Only nine institutions (3%) had swimming pools in their unions (Table 129), which is down from the 10 schools (6%) responding in Bell's study. Three per cent of the unions in all categories, including age-of-union, had pools, which indicates that some of the 6% with pools in 1962 did not respond in 1971.

Almost half (47%) the 278 schools had *card room* facilities (Table 129). The former study showed 57% but did not necessarily mean a special room. The 1971 questionnaire asked about special cardroom facilities, although some undoubtedly did not confine their responses to having a separate room. No significant variations were indicated in the percentage breakdown, as was the case with the high rate of 74% that Bell found in rural schools. Newer unions again were more likely to have separate card rooms than older unions (54%, compared with 41%, and 66% with 51%, in the Bell study). Thirty-nine unions (31%)

used 6-8 card tables (Table 140), which Bell also found most frequently. However, Bell found many unions had more than 12 tables; this study did not, finding instead that 3-5 tables (24%) and 9-12 tables (21%) were most common.

Only four schools (1%) included *ice-skating rinks* in their union facilities (Table 129), compared with Bell's 11 schools (6%), which again indicates that many of the older unions did not respond in this survey. It may also indicate that ice-skating rinks, which are expensive, are neither considered necessary nor feasible in union construction.

Table-*shuffleboard* and floor-shuffleboard facilities (Table 129) were checked by only 36 (13%) and 7 (3%) unions, respectively. They were evenly spread among all types of schools, these figures are similar to Bell's.

Foosball, a specialty table game, and the remaining recreation facilities included in this section were not included in Bell's study. Twenty-eight schools (10%) provided foosball. Thirteen were in the 5,000-9,999 enrollment group, and the urban schools, with 18, led the group.

Only nine (3%) said they included *other table games* in their facilities. No significant figures are evident other than that more of the 1963-1972 schools responded than the pre-1962 groups.

Pin-ball machines were provided by 33 unions (12%). The range of percentages was fairly even in all categories, except for the fewer-than-2,500 schools and rural schools, of which only 7% provided machines.

Thirteen unions (5%) operated gymnasiums that were adequate for volleyball and basketball. These facilities were spread evenly among the three larger enrollment categories, and, as expected, 10 were found at urban schools, where often there is no separate athletic department. Gymnasiums appear to be a more recent inclusion since nine of the union gymnasiums were built after 1962.

Other exercise rooms, which include weight lifting and exercycles, were operated by 13 schools (5%). The percentages were comparable to those found in the gymnasium statistics, except that the more-than-10,000 group offered these facilities more frequently than the other groups.

Only five schools (2%) provided *rifle ranges.*

Fourteen institutions (5%) had *boat-house* facilities, which included boat and canoe rentals. It appears that unions in the two larger enrollment brackets and rural schools are most likely to have boat houses.

Skiing facilities were minimal. Eleven unions (4%) provided ski shops, with ski rentals. The percentages were fairly even in this category, except that the fewer-than-2,500 group had only one ski-shop facility.

A slightly larger number of schools, 17 (6%), [illegible] *ting centers* or lodges away from campus. Unions in the two larger enrollment categories most frequently provided such facilities.

Twenty institutions (7%) had *chess rooms* that were definitely separate from card rooms or snack bars. Chess rooms were found more frequently at urban and suburban unions than at rural schools. Surprisingly, only three of the more-than-10,000 group provided separate chess rooms.

Social Facilities (Tables 129, 141-144)

Ballrooms (Table 129) were provided in almost three-fourths (73%, or 202) of the 278 responding schools—almost exactly the same as the percentage reported in the Bell study (72%). The enrollment breakdown showed both the smaller categories were below the general percentage. Bell found only the small-school category below his average percentage, and the other three categories were well over this figure. As with Bell's findings, fewer new unions (67%) included ballrooms than older ones (78%) although the difference is much greater than in the Bell study, probably reflecting the continuing decline of student interest in large dances, plus the inability of smaller institutions to finance large facilities of this kind. Both studies showed that union ballrooms were most frequently found in urban schools (80%) and at the largest schools (85% of 5,000-9,999 schools and 95% of more-than-10,000 schools).

Eighty-two per cent of those with ballrooms had only one ballroom (Table 141), an increase from Bell's 74%. In Bell's study 41% of unions at the more-than-10,000 schools had two ballrooms, but in this study the figure dropped to 30%, with 59% having one ballroom.

Typical uses of union ballrooms (Table 142) were: meetings (91%), lectures (88%), conferences (84%), banqueting (80%), movies (77%), receptions (74%), fashion shows (71%) and exhibits (64%). Most results were comparable to Bell's, except that movies and fashion shows became more popular than exhibits, and meetings and lectures replaced the former leader, conferences. (Dances were not listed as a "typical use" since it was assumed all ballrooms would be used for dancing at some time. However, in view of all the other uses, dancing may no longer be the major use. "Ballroom" may well be a misnomer.)

Seventy-eight (28% of 278) schools had *party rooms*—most frequently they were more-than-10,000 schools (38%) and suburban campuses (Table 129). In all enrollment categories, the percentage of unions with party rooms in the Bell survey was substantially higher than in this survey. The Bell survey also showed a third (34%) of all unions (pre-1962 of course) had party rooms, while this study showed only 29% of the pre-1962 group had such facilities. Again, the facility would have made a stronger showing had half the unions in the Bell study not failed to respond in 1971.

More unions (89%) had *lounges* than in Bell's study, up from Bell's 82% (Table 129). Most of the results were comparable to the Bell study, with slightly more of the newer unions providing lounges than the older ones. A figure of interest is evident in the "type-of-school" category, in which all 63 suburban schools had lounges—one of the few 100% responses in the questionnaire. One might suppose that *every* union would have a lounge of some kind. However, there are indeed unions with only snack bars as lounges. And, of course, there is always some inaccuracy due to inadvertent or careless non-checking on the questionnaire.

A third of the unions had one lounge (Table 143); 28% had two; 16% had three. These figures confirm Bell's findings. Generally, the larger the enrollment—hence, the larger the union—the more lounges, as might be expected.

Eighty-two schools (29% of 278) had *faculty lounges* (non-exclusive use), a figure close to Bell's (33%). All enrollment groups reflected the average percentage (Table 129), while the suburban schools, instead of rural as before, registered below the average. The declining interest in this facility that Bell found continued—only 30 (24%) of the 126 post-1962 unions included faculty lounges. Note that these facilities were shared by others. Most (94%) of the schools providing lounges (not necessarily exclusively for faculty), provided only one (Table 144).

A few unions, 16%, provided *faculty lounges exclusively* for faculty and their guests (Table 129). The fewer-than-2,500 schools led the others with 19%, as did the suburban campuses. Other results were fairly even. Only about half the unions (16%) that provided faculty lounging facilities (29%) favored the policy of exclusive use.

Few, 4%, provided *faculty clubs exclusively* for faculty and their guests. The only significant conclusion is that faculty clubs are formed mainly at large schools and that this type of exclusive-use union facility is on the decline: only three post-1962 unions maintained such facilities, compared with nine pre-1962 unions.

Several social facilities were added to this survey. Thirty-six per cent, or 101 schools, had *coffee houses* (entertainment and refreshments) separate from snack bars. It appears that the larger schools in urban and suburban settings were most likely to operate such facilities. In the 5,000-9,999-enrollment group, 55% had coffee houses. The percentages for the older and newer unions were about equal, indicating that the older unions had converted rooms or acquired coffee houses in new additions to meet the rising student demand for such entertainment.

Outdoor terraces or patios, which are used for lounging, refreshments, outdoor social and musical programming, and other similar events, were prevalent, even at urban unions. Sixty-two per cent (172 schools) provided this type of facility. All enrollment groups fell just below this average except the more-than-10,000 group, of which 77% provided patios. School types were fairly close, but, significantly, more of the post-1962 unions (69%) provided terraces than the pre-1962 unions (56%).

Forty-four per cent (123 unions) provided lounges or *powder rooms* for women only. Larger schools and urban unions, which also had a higher incidence of ballrooms—with which a powder room is often associated—more often had powder rooms. Fifty-nine per cent of the more-than-10,000 schools and 47% of the urban schools had lounges for women only. There was a small decrease in such facilities from pre-1962 (47%) to post-1962 operations (41%), as with ballrooms.

Only forty-five schools (16%) had *lounges for men only*. The only variation was that the 2,500-4,999 campuses (21%) and 5,000-9,999 campuses (25%) most frequently had such facilities.

An interesting facility included in this survey was *program lounge*, which is primarily for scheduled discussions, readings, music and television programs, film talks and other activities. Forty-two per cent (117 schools) provided this facility. Most of the data was near or above this percentage. It is interesting to note that the urban schools fell below the average (34%) and the suburban schools were far above (60%). It is probable that many unions had not developed separate program lounges primarily for "program purposes" (as the question stated), but rather were using general lounges or other existing lounges for scheduled programs.

Cultural-Hobby Facilities (Tables 129, 145-149)

Fifty-five per cent (153) of 278 unions provided *music listening rooms* (Table 129) compared with 70% in Bell's study. The two smaller enrollment groups less frequently had such facilities. Rural and suburban schools were above the average percentage, but urban schools fell below (52%). Quite interesting were the totals in the union-age brackets, with pre-1962 unions showing 63% (compared with Bell's 70% for the same age group), and post-1962 unions declining to only 45%. Here is further evidence of the effect of the failure of half of the unions in the Bell study to reply in this survey and of the influence in the post-1962 category of the substantial number of two-year-college unions in that group, only 24% of which had music rooms.

More schools (55%, or 153) used the lounge-type music room than the booth type (14%, or 40). When they had such facilities, most (80%) schools in the three lower enrollment groups provided one lounge (not as many as in 1962). Schools in the more-than-10,000 category were more likely to have more than one music room—35% compared with 43% in the Bell study (another reflection of the absence of many larger, older unions in the current study).

Forty unions provided *music listening booths* (Table 146); the three largest enrollment groups usually had two or more. Most unions (65%) had four or six booths, up from Bell's three or four booths (52%).

Seventeen per cent, a decrease from Bell's 22% had *music practice* *rooms* (Table 147). Only the more-than-10,000 group (23%) showed much of an increase over the average percentage. Only 8% of the rural schools had practice rooms, while the percentage of urban and suburban unions having them was above the average. Continuing a downward trend, fewer post-1962 schools (13%) had practice rooms than pre-1962 schools (20%)—again partly influenced by the smaller, two-year-college unions in the post-1962 category. Nineteen (40%) of the 47 with practice rooms provided one room; 60% had more than one.

The number of unions having *photo dark room* facilities (Table 129) increased from 46% to 51%. All enrollment groups approximated the average. As in Bell's study, urban schools (57%) exceeded rural (38%). The percentage of schools including darkrooms since 1962 reversed the trend indicated in Bell's study, decreasing from 55% to 48% of new unions rather than increasing in frequence among new unions.

More than half (51%, or 141) of the unions had *poster rooms* (Table 129), compared with the earlier study results of 59%. The fewer-than-2,500 unions were again low with only 31%, but the 2,500–4,999 schools showed an unusual high of 71%. The percentage of unions with poster rooms in the two larger enrollment brackets decreased greatly (from 73%) and neared the average (51%). The absence in 1971 of the 90 larger, older unions could account for this difference. (Note that Bell's total group of pre-1962 unions showed 59% had poster rooms, while this pre-1962 group showed 51%.)

Outing headquarters (Table 129) were provided by only 12% of the unions, compared with 16% in Bell's study. This does not necessarily mean a decline of interest in outing facilities because so many of the pre-1962 unions were missing in this survey. In both studies the percentage of recently established unions that provided outing quarters increased slightly. The fewer-than-2,500 schools showed minimal adoption of these facilities.

In this study, as in Bell's, only a few (17%) had *amateur-radio rooms* (Table 129). Radio facilities were provided rather equally by all enrollment groups, rather than principally by the more-than-10,000 schools, as Bell indicated. Pre-1962 and urban unions accounted for a majority of the 48 radio installations.

Twenty-four per cent, an increase of 6% since Bell's study, included union *auditoriums*, other than ballrooms (Table 129). The two small-enrollment groups were below average, while the two large-enrollment groups were near or well above it, especially the more-than 10,000 group at 47%. Providing an auditorium was on the decline, as only 21% of the post-1962 unions had this facility. Again, reasons are partly that this age group included 33 two-year-college unions (only 9% of which built auditoriums) and generally included many small unions that could not afford auditoriums, and partly because even the large unions, though they plan for an auditorium, postpone it for lack of funds until they can build an addition. Note, however, that of the unions at larger, more affluent schools (10,000+), 47% had auditoriums in this survey compared with 38% in Bell's study.

Seating capacities in union auditoriums, as indicated in Bell's study, were usually small. Of the 67 schools with auditoriums (Table 148), half sat 250-500; 16% sat fewer than 250; and 15% sat 501-750.

An increased proportion of unions (19%) had *theaters* with working stages (Table 129). The two large-enrollment groups showed 22% and 29%, well ahead of the two small-enrollment groups, but fewer of the post-1962 unions (17%) had this facility than the pre-1962 unions (21%), an opposite indication from Bell's results. This may well reflect an increasing tendency to build a drama theater as part of a fine-arts complex. Generally, larger enrollments mean larger facilities, as indicated in Table 149, but for the most part the 53 respondents built theaters that seated 250-500 (55%) and fewer than 250 (22%). Combining unions that have auditoriums (24%) with those that have theaters (19%) indicated that 43% of the 278 unions had "auditorium"-type facilities—a substantial increase from Bell's 30%. In addition, 48% of the pre-1962 schools and only 38% of the post-1962 schools had one or the other of these facilities (partly the influence of the two-year-college unions, of which only 27% had an auditorium or theater), compared with Bell's 33% and 27%, respectively, for pre-1957 and post-1957 unions.

Overall response to the *craft-shop* facility (Table 129) was down to 15% from Bell's tally of 21%. More of the largest schools (10,000+) had craft shops (35%) than the others, and the smaller schools were much less likely to have the facility. Very few rural schools had craft shops, and the percentage of post-1962 unions with shops was smaller (15%) than the pre-1962 group's (16%), a difference accounted for by the absence of a shop in all the two-year-college unions.

Seventy per cent (195 schools) provided a *television room* (Table 129), a decrease from Bell's 83%. This may be attributed in part to schools' having television facilities other than rooms designated specifically for this purpose and in part to the declining popularity of television among students. For example, the percentage of post-1962 unions with such rooms decreased to 66%, which may well be due to this combination of circumstances. The more-than-10,000 institutions had a high of 89%, and three-fourths of the urban schools had television rooms.

The statistics of *browsing rooms* (Table 129) would lead one to believe their popularity dropped off about 30%—from 34% of all unions in 1962 to 24% in 1971. But this is not likely. For one thing, the Bell survey showed 34% of all pre-1962 unions had browsing rooms, while this study showed only 24% of the pre-1962 group (90 of the 1962 unions' not responding in 1971) had them. Another factor is that only one of the 33 two-year-college unions in 1971 provided a browsing room (3%); nevertheless, more in the post-1962 group, which included these unions, had browsing rooms than in the pre-1962 group. It is probable that the ratio of browsing rooms in four-year-college unions continues at about the same 34% level, although most of them occur in the large unions.

To provide a more complete picture of *art-exhibition* facilities (Table 129), this study divided the facilities into three types: separate, enclosed gallery; lounge exhibition space; and corridor-lobby exhibition space. These ways of displaying art are not mutually exclusive; that is, some unions employ two types, or all three.

The least frequently adopted facility was the separate, enclosed gallery (24), usually because of lack of funds or the presence of another gallery on campus. A steady increase is observable in each enrollment range from the smaller to the more-than 10,000 schools, of which 36% had separate galleries. More urban schools provided the enclosed gallery (26%) than rural schools. More of the post-1962 unions built enclosed gallery rooms than those of pre-1962 era (28% to 21%, respectively).

Forty per cent (110 schools) included a general lounge exhibition space. The more-than-10,000 unions also led in this category with 53%, but the fewer-than-2,500 group surprisingly indicated 36%. The union-age category varied little, and urban and suburban schools led rural unions with an average of 40%.

Most unions (54%) provided corridor-lobby exhibition space. Here, the frequency of this facility increased as school enrollments became larger, with 65% of the more-than-10,000 group providing it. Suburban unions (63%) provided more of this type of art facility than other schools. Fifty-two per cent of the post-1962 unions had corridor-lobby exhibition space, compared with 56% of the per-1962 group. As it becomes more difficult to obtain insurance on corridor exhibitions and as other problems appear, the decline in the corridor approach may become much more pronounced.

Bell wrote in 1962 that the questionnaire would have received more responses if "room" were specified instead of *rehearsal "theater."* (Table 129). There was indeed an increase from 6% for "theater" in Bell's study to 11% for "room" in this study. More larger schools, as expected, included a theater rehearsal room than smaller schools. No change was apparent in the union-age categories.

A few schools (9%) provided a *paperback-book center* separate from the campus bookstore. This facility was most frequently found in the more-than-10,000 schools (18%). Only 6% of the post-1962 unions included book centers compared with 12% of the pre-1962 group. The rapid increase of bookstores in unions in recent times apparently obviates the desire, or need, for a separate paper-back center.

Meeting Facilities (Tables 129, 150, 151)

Eighty-four per cent (233) provided *small committee rooms* (Table 129). As in the Bell study, these rooms appeared consistently, and more of the newer unions (94%) had them than the older unions (82%, although this 82% is probably an understatement, inasmuch as the Bell pre-1962 group showed 91% had committee rooms). Fifty-two per cent of the responding schools, compared with 41% in Bell's study, had two to four committee rooms (Table 150). This number was most frequent in the three lowest enrollment groups. Many unions in the more-than-10,000 schools had five to 10 rooms (42%). In contrast with Bell's study, in which 22 (14%) unions had more than 10 small committee rooms, only 13 unions (6%) had more than 10 rooms—again the effect of the many Bell respondents missing from this survey.

Most unions (88%) had *meeting rooms*. This is nine percentage points more than in Bell's study and undoubtedly would have been still higher had all the Bell respondents reported in this survey. As with the small committee rooms, the number of rooms increased with the size of the school enrollment and in relation to recent construction. The urban and suburban unions (95%) tended to include meeting rooms more consistently than rural unions. More unions (34%) had two to four rooms, influenced by the fewer-than-2,500 group, 55% of which had two to four rooms (Table 151). Again, but more pronounced, as enrollments increased, the number of rooms also increased. For example, the 2,500-4,999 and 5,000-9,999 groups indicated identical percentages of 24% in the seven to 10 room range, while 55% of the more-than-10,000 schools reported more than 10 rooms—up from 44% in Bell's study. Meeting rooms—several in number—have become virtually a universal union facility.

Service Facilities (Tables 129, 152-161)

Fifty-four per cent of the responding schools had *unattended coat rooms* (Table 129). These facilities were more frequently found as enrollments increased. Half the pre-1962 unions and 59% of the post-1962 unions had unattended coat rooms, a change that was also evident in the Bell study. However, the validity of this kind of increase is in doubt because Bell's study showed 67% of the pre-1962 unions with unattended coat rooms. Eighty-two per cent of the 150 unions with such facilities had one or two rooms; 3% had five.

Thirty per cent had *attended check rooms*. Again, incidence of this facility increased with enrollment size. As Bell also found, a smaller percentage of the recently established unions had attended check rooms. A third (34%) of the pre-1962 schools had this facility compared with 27% of the newer operations. Also, urban unions dropped from 42% to 28%, with suburban unions in the lead (35%), which is surprising because urban unions, with their higher ratio of student and faculty commuters, ordinarily have a greater need for attended checking. Ninety-two per cent of the 84 responding schools had one attended check room (Table 153). Only nine unions charged for this service.

An *information desk* was provided by about nine out of 10 unions (88%, compared with 87% in Bell's study). Except in the more-than-10,000 schools, the information desk was usually related physically to administrative offices (Table 154). The sale of newspapers, cigarettes, candy and other things was part of the services in 112 schools (46%).

Only 14 schools (5%) provided a *Western Union* facility. Eleven per cent of the largest unions had it, while only one of the fewer-than-2,500 group had it, as in Bell's study. A decline was noticeable among the newer unions (from 7% to 2%). Easy long-distance dialing has apparently taken the place of telegrams.

Public (pay) telephones were reported in 95% (93% in Bell's study) of the 278 schools. All the more-than-10,000 group and the suburban schools had public telephones. The smallest schools had one or two phones; the 2,500-4,999 group had one to six; the 5,000-9,999 unions had three or four (40%); and the more-than-10,000 unions had more than eight (50%, Table 155).

An increase in *house telephones* for general campus use was indicated, as 68% (190 schools) had this facility compared with 52% in Bell's study. Regardless of enrollment or other breakdown, 65-71% of all unions provided house phones. Most of the 190 responding institutions (68%) had one or two house phones (Table 156). Thirty-seven per cent of the unions in the more-than-10,000 schools provided three or four phones and 10% provided more than eight.

Postal service facilities were checked by 46% of the 278 unions. A reverse trend from that found by Bell was evident in that fewer of the newer unions, with 43%, had such facilities (49% of older unions had them). The fewer-than-2,500 unions (51%) and the more-than-10,000 (59%) unions were far ahead of the other groups in providing postal service, and rural unions (51%), where postal facilities are less available, led the urban and suburban unions.

A total of 83 unions (30%, compared with Bell's 33%) provided individual student *mail boxes*. The fewer-than-2,500 schools ranged far ahead of the other three enrollment groups with a total of 49% (higher than Bell's 40%), while the rural unions had a high of 36%, confirming that it is still common for small schools, especially in rural locations where there are few commuters, to deliver mail to the union rather than to dormitories.

Sixty-one unions (22%) housed government *postal sub-stations*. Again, percentages for all categories were fairly close except that 35% of the largest unions included sub-stations. No change was noted between the older and newer unions.

A few unions, 26 (9%), operated a government-post-office *contract station*. Most of these were in the largest unions (23%) and in the urban and suburban unions. Noteworthy is the decrease from 13% incidence in older unions to 5% in newer unions.

Ticket offices were found in half the unions. More larger schools had this facility—the fewer-than-2,500 group registered 40% with the percentage increasing in each enrollment category to 61% in the largest unions. Rural unions, with only 41%, trailed urban and suburban institutions, of which 50% and 59%, respectively, had ticket offices. The above data agree generally with Bell's findings. The exception in this question was that the newer schools showed 52% compared with 49% for the older group, whereas Bell found ticket offices decreasing in the unions more recently established.

Pick-up laundry and dry cleaning were provided by only 7% of the unions. This figure is less than Bell's, and further evidence of declining incidence can be cited in the age category, where 8% of the older unions had pick-up laundries compared with 5% of the more recent unions—all probably due to widespread adoption of washing machines in dormitories and the shift of student dress styles, which do not require clothes that need dry cleaning.

Barber shops were provided by 31% (87) of the unions—only a slight drop from the 34% reporting barber shops in Bell's study. While unions at smaller schools, especially the 2,500-4,999 enrollment group, showed a substantial decrease in barber facilities when compared with Bell's study, this decrease was partly offset by an increase in the more-than-10,000 group—from 50% to 55%. The most revealing finding, however, is that only 21% of the post-1962 unions adopted barber shops compared with 39% of the pre-1962 group, or about half as many. This is a reflection partly of the fact that only one (3%) of the 33 two-year-college unions (part of the newer group) included a barber shop. But it is also, and probably mainly, a reflection of the change in men's hair styles that began in the mid-1960s and led to less interest and less need for barber facilities. Some barber shops actually closed in recent years for lack of sufficient patronage.

Of the 87 institutions with barber shops, 40% had three to four barber chairs (Table 157). The fewer-than-2,500 schools that had shops listed one or two chairs most frequently (75%); 86% of the 2,500-4,999 and 91% of the 5,000-9,999 schools had one to four chairs; and 72% of the largest schools had three to six chairs. More schools continued to charge on a space rental basis than on a commission basis.

Beauty shops were seldom provided (6%), as in Bell's study (5%). More of the larger and urban schools tended to offer this service than the smaller and rural unions, as might be expected. The newer unions indicated that only 2% had beauty shops, another sign of changing hair styles, the influence of the two-year-college unions (no beauty shop reported) on the survey results, and, very likely, the non-success of beauty shops evident even in the pre-1962 unions.

Locker facilities were provided by 164 schools (59%), a sharp increase over the 43% reporting lockers in Bell's study. All enrollment categories were near or above the average except the smallest schools (51%). Rural unions (64%) reported the highest incidence of locker facilities. More newer unions (61%) had locker facilities than older unions (57%).

Of the unions providing such facilities, 93 used coin-operated lockers (Table 158). The number of lockers varied: 1-25 lockers—23%, 26-50 lockers—22% and 51-100 lockers—22%. Fifty-one to 100 lockers were reported by 27% of both the 5,000-9,999 and more-than 10,000 enrollment groups and more-than-200 lockers by 17% of the 5,000-9,999 schools and 27% of the more-than 10,000 schools.

Seventy-one schools had *rental lockers* (Table 159). The two ranges most frequently checked were 51-100 lockers (21%) and more than 200 (28%), instead of the 26-50 popular in Bell's study.

A *travel agency* was provided by 13% of the unions up from the 8% in Bell's study. Travel agencies were found in the two largest enrollment categories. Their popularity appears to be increasing: 14% of the newer unions had travel services compared with 11% of the older unions.

More than half (53%, or 148) of the 278 schools provided parking areas, with the smallest schools (57%) slightly leading the other size categories. This is explained by the fact that most of the all-commuter, two-year colleges are in this enrollment range. The urban institutions (large commuter populations), with 56% providing union parking, expectedly exceeded others (49%). More newer unions (56%) provided parking than older unions (51%).

Staff parking facilities for college personnel were provided at 103 unions (Table 160). Thirty-two per cent accommodated 1-10 cars, and 30% accommodated more than 50 cars. Bell found that each enrollment group scored most heavily in the more-than-50 range, with 45% providing 50 or more spaces for staff cars; but it should be remembered that half the unions in the Bell study did not report in this survey. The current results indicated a relationship between limited parking and smaller schools and between expanded facilities and larger schools. Forty-three per cent of the fewer-than-2,500 schools and 52% of the 2,500-4,999 group provided 1-10 spaces for staff cars. Thirty-four per cent of the 5,000-9,999 group and 56% of the more-than-10,000 schools provided more than 50 spaces.

Public parking was provided by 101 unions (68% of 148 respondents, Table 161). Half these schools (49%) could accommodate more than 150 cars, an increase over Bell's 41%. Several unions provided both public and staff parking, resulting in overlapping responses. In addition, it appears that some respondents, due to misunderstanding, combined staff and public parking under one heading, making it difficult to differentiate the number of spaces provided for staff from those provided for public parking. Most unions offered free parking for both staff and the public.

The study indicated that *banking* facilities (a new listing in 1971) were found in 15% of all unions. This seems doubtful, however, because generally banks are found only at larger unions, and, according to this survey, only 9% of the unions at the largest schools had banking facilities; whereas more of the smaller enrollment groups had banks—21% of the 2,500-4,999 schools and 13% of the fewer-than-2,500 schools. It seems hardly possible that branch banks would find it profitable to operate for such a small clientele. Some respondents may have interpreted bank to mean only check cashing or that there was a bank in the vicinity. On the other hand, all clearly said the *bank* operated on a space-rental basis, adding to the confusion.

A minute response of four schools indicated that *coin-operated laundry machines* in unions were a rarity. Such machines apparently are found almost exclusively in dormitories and commerical establishments.

Nine unions (3%) had a nursery or child day-care room (new listing). Eight per cent of the 2,500-4,999 enrollment group had this facility (none at the smallest schools), and no responses were recorded for the rural unions. There is some evidence of a growing tendency to provide a day-care center: 5% of the newer unions had the facility compared with 2% of the older unions.

Typing rooms (new listing) were provided by 22 (8%) of the unions. Percentages were near 8% in each category, except for suburban (14%) and rural unions (3%)—for reasons unknown.

One-fifth (55) provided *print shops* for job printing (new listing). Percentages tended to increase with enrollment size and from older to newer unions. More of the suburban unions (25%) had print shops than urban or rural unions.

Food Facilities (Tables 129, 162-168)

Three-fourths (74%, or 205) of the unions had *cafeterias* (Table 129), a drop from Bell's 84%. Urban (75%) and suburban (86%) schools provided cafeteria services more often than their rural counterparts (59%), who led in the Bell study with 96%. Seventy-nine per cent of the older unions and 67% of the newer unions provided cafeterias. This is partially explained by the fact that the newer group includes the 33 two-year-college unions, of which only 61% provided cafeterias. Also, in the current returns, the smaller the institution the less likely it was to have a union cafeteria (60% of the smallest schools, 89% of the largest schools had them). Smaller schools, many in the rural category, are often almost completely residential and have built dining halls, either with the dormitories or the unions, to serve all students. While such union dining halls are mostly self-service, they provide largely set meals rather than full, cafeteria-choice menus, so it may well be that some unions did not report such dining halls as cafeterias in this survey. This would substantially reduce the incidence of cafeterias in smaller unions, rural unions and overall categories. This, coupled with the fact that 84% of Bell's pre-1962 unions had cafeterias compared with 79% of this study's pre-1962 group, leads to the conclusion that a higher percentage of unions had full-meal service facilities than this study's results indicate.

Similar to the Bell study, *seating capacities*, ranging from 100-200 to 751-1,000, were spread rather evenly over six capacity categories, regardless of school size (Table 162). It would appear that cafeteria capacity is conditioned not so much by the number of students enrolled as by what other dining facilities are provided on the campus or whether the union serves dormitory students.

Eighteen per cent (49) of the 205 unions with cafeterias served dormitory students. One-fifth of the fewer-than-2,500 schools and 27% of the 5,000-9,999 schools provided this additional service, compared with only 6% of the largest unions.

Snack bars were, as in Bell's study, among the most frequently provided facilities (87% in this study, 89% in Bell's study). Unions in all categories scored consistently high with suburban schools highest at 97%. The largest schools, at 91%, became part of the pattern, unlike the Bell study, in which—possibly because of confusion with *coffee shop*—only three-fourths reported having snack bars. The newer unions jumped to 90%, compared with the older unions' 84% (89% of Bell's pre-1962 unions had them).

Snack-bar seating capacities were spread fairly evenly over the six size categories, which ranged from fewer than 100 to more than 500 although one-third reported a 100-200 capacity (Table 163). In contrast with cafeteria capacities, the larger the school, the larger the snack bar, regardless of the existence of other campus food facilities. For example, 26% of the largest unions had more than 500 seats.

In comparison with Bell's findings of 26%, this survey showed 22% of the unions had a *restaurant with waiter service*, with the percentage rising as enrollment increased. Only the largest enrollment group (47%), not the 5,000-9,999 schools as before, scored higher than the overall average. Waiter-service restaurants continued to decline in incidence; only 14% of the newer unions had adopted them compared with 27% of the older unions.

There is a wider spread of *seating capacities* in this study than in the Bell study (Table 164). Bell found capacities clustered around 76-100 and more-than-200 seats. Of the 60 schools in this study that had restaurants with waiter service, 23% had 76-100 seats; 22% had 101-150; 18% had 51-75: and 18% had more than 200. Seating facilities, as expected, increased with school enrollments.

Twelve per cent (32) of the schools had *coffee shops*, close to Bell's 11%. Bell found this facility mainly at the largest enrollment level (19%), which dropped to 12% in this study, while the 5,000-9,999 schools jumped to a leading 23%. *Seating capacities* (Table 165) were usually 101-150 (41%). This, plus another one-fifth reporting capacities of more than 150, suggests that many were not reporting about the usual small coffee shop but, in more common union usage, a snack bar, choosing to call it a coffee shop. While the confusion was not as great as in Bell's study, the term *coffee shop* should be better defined in future surveys, or omitted.

Half the unions (49%, or 136) had *private dining rooms*, which, on the surface, appears to be a decline from Bell's 56%. However, had all Bell's pre-1962 unions responded and had the two-year-college unions (only 36% of which had private dining rooms) not been included in this survey, it is likely the results would have approximated Bell's. The seeming decline from 53% of the older unions having private dining rooms to 43% of the newer unions is partially explained by these same factors.

Of the unions with private dining rooms, more than half (57%, or 78) had one or two such facilities (Table 166). The number of rooms increased with enrollment until almost half the largest schools (47%) had more than five rooms.

Vending-machine rooms were provided by half (49%) of the unions. All enrollment groups scored average or above except the 5,000-9,999 group (37%). These facilities are more likely, as Bell stated, to be found in the larger schools and at urban (49%) and suburban (50%) unions, where vending-service agencies are more readily available. Vending-machine rooms were on the increase: 52% of the newer unions had them compared with 45% of the older unions.

Only 59 schools had *seating* in their vending-machine rooms (Table 167). Where there was separate seating, capacity ranged from 10 to more than 150 and was fairly evenly distributed throughout the five size brackets shown in Table 167. Thirteen unions provided seating for more than 150, including three unions at the smallest schools and five in the largest schools—indicating a complete food-vending service that possibly substituted for a snack bar in some unions. The number of vending machines, in general, increased with enrollments (Table 168). The most common numbers of machines were 5-6 (28%) and 7-8 (22%). Thirty-one per cent of the unions at 5,000-9,999 schools and 41% of those at more-than-10,000 schools had more than 10 machines—a considerable increase over Bell's findings. Most unions continued to contract for the operation and maintenance of the machines, paying the commercial operator a commission, rather than owning and operating the machines themselves.

Banqueting facilities were reported by 76% of the unions—almost identical to Bell's 77%. Again, as in Bell's study, the larger the enrollment the more likely was the union to have banquet facilities. Ninety-one per cent of the largest unions had banquet rooms; 63% of the smallest unions had them. Usually the banquet room is the ballroom, and there is indeed a close correspondence between the number of unions with ballrooms and the number providing banquets. However, it seems odd that a union would be prepared to serve a banquet (76% were) but not a smaller, private dinner (only half reported private dining rooms). Seventy-eight per cent of the older unions had banquet facilities compared with 73% of the newer unions, probably likely because the number of newer unions with ballrooms also declined.

Self-service kitchenettes were provided by only 13% of the unions, a drop from Bell's 22%. More of the largest schools, 18%, had this facility than others, compared with 39% in Bell's survey. Again the absence of many of Bell's respondents and the presence of two-year-college unions in this survey partially explain the change.

Tavern (with beer) was written in by five unions (2%). Although this is not now significant, changing campus policies and new laws granting adult status at 18 makes an increase in popularity of this newly developing facility fairly certain.

Commuter Facilities (Tables 129, 169, 170)

Thirty-six per cent (101) of the unions provided *lockers* specifically for commuting students (compared with 59% that provided lockers for general use). This percentage prevailed regardless of school size and was an increase over Bell's 28%. In Bell's study, commuter lockers were, as expected, mainly provided by urban and suburban unions, while in this study they were most frequently found at rural unions. The reason for this shift is not apparent; possibly rural schools in the last 10 years have made more of an effort to attract and serve students in their local areas (commuters). An increase also occurred, but to a lesser degree, at urban and suburban unions, where the proportion of commuters has been rising. Generally, locker provisions for commuters were increasing; 42% of the newer unions provided lockers, compared with 31% of the older unions.

Eighty-three unions reported the number of lockers they had (Table 169); the number increased, as expected, with enrollment. Twenty-one per cent had more than 200 lockers; 23% had 26-50; and 23% had 101-200.

A separate *lounge for commuters* was provided by 26% of the unions. However, it seems likely some were simply indicating that either there were general lounging facilities that commuters used, or, as in all-commuter schools, the general lounge was a commuter lounge. The percentage was about equal in all enrollment groups, and urban unions led rural unions 28% to 21%. A rising incidence of commuter lounges seems to be indicated: 28% of the newer unions had them, compared with 23% of the older unions. The confusion over the meaning of commuter lounge is apparent when one notes that 41% of Bell's unions (almost twice as many as the pre-1962 group in this survey) said they had commuter lounges. In future surveys the question should ask about a "separate lounge planned for use *only* by commuters."

Other special facilities for commuters—dining rooms, cot rooms, dressing rooms, offices—were provided by only 8-10% of the unions, primarily by urban and suburban schools. Only one union had a study room for commuters. See Tables 129 and 170.

Organization Facilities, Administrative Offices (Tables 129, 171-174, 176)

Forty-five per cent of the unions (125) provided *general work rooms* for student organizations, compared with Bell's 57%. The percentage obviously would have been higher had all of Bell's respondents reported in this survey. More than half (53%) the newer unions had general work rooms. Much lower percentages were reported for the smallest schools (34%) and rural schools (33%) since far fewer student organizations in these schools require work headquarters.

Filing facilities were provided by 56% of the unions (157, Table 172). The incidence of filing facilities was fairly even among all enrollment groups. The only major variances were the suburban (84%) and urban (43%) unions. Newer unions (64%) showed a considerable gain over older unions (50%). The number of file cabinets varied from 1-5 (26%) to more than 50 (16%), with more than a third (35%) of the 5,000-9,999 schools and a fourth of the largest schools reporting they had more than 50 cabinets.

Desk facilities produced much the same response as filing facilities. Half the unions (139) had them, with percentages differing widely from the average only in the following categories: suburban, 76%; rural, 57%; and urban, 36%. The newer unions again showed a tremendous increase (67%) over the older unions (35%). A trend was evident in the number of desks provided for student organizations (Table 173). Almost half (47%) had more than eight desks (compared with one-fifth in the Bell study), and 21% checked 3-4 desks (compared with Bell's 25%). As Bell found, usually the larger the school, and therefore the more organizations, the more desks provided: 71% of the largest unions furnished more than eight desks, compared with 30% of the smallest enrollment group.

Mail boxes for organizations were provided by 186 unions (67%), an increase over Bell's 59%. The percentages for the three highest enrollment groups were above average, while only half the smallest group provided mail boxes for organizations. Two-fifths (112) of the unions had *organization storage lockers*. As in Bell's study, the fewer-than-2,500 schools scored below average (30%). There was only a slight increase in the union-age category, from 39% of the older unions to 41% of the newer unions.

Campus radio stations were housed by 29% of the unions. Enrollment and type of school made little difference, except that more (37%) of the suburban unions reported stations than the urban (27%) or rural (25%) unions. Radio stations were on the increase: 32% of the newer unions reported stations, compared with 26% of the older group.

The Bell survey indicated that only a modest proportion of unions (24%) housed *campus newspaper offices*, with only 19% of the recently established unions providing them. But in this survey, two-thirds (67%) of all unions had newspaper offices, with 72% of the newer unions providing them—a definite turnabout.

On the other hand, an identical percentage, 60%, of both the unions in Bell's survey and in this survey reported having *yearbook offices*, the percentages being substantially higher in unions in the two smaller enrollment groups than in the two larger ones (as Bell also found). The percentage was also higher in recently established unions (68%) than in older unions (53%), again approximating Bell's findings.

Offices for *union boards* and/or union committees were provided by 67% (185), which compares to Bell's 69%. The result would have been higher had all Bell's respondents reported in this survey and had the two-year-college unions (only 39% of which had union-board offices) been omitted. Both the smallest schools (62%) and the largest schools (65%) were slightly below the average. Providing union-board offices was apparently on the increase: 71% of the newer unions had them, compared with only 62% of the older unions.

Two-thirds of the 156 responding unions had one union-board office (Table 171); 16% provided more than three.

Student-government offices were provided by 78% of the unions, compared with 81% in Bell's study. The three largest enrollment groups scored above average, while the smallest schools were low with 69%. Unlike union offices, provisions for student government did not increase in unions established since 1962.

Inter-fraternity-council offices were housed by 22% and *Pan-hellenic offices* by 18% of the unions. These are somewhat lower percentages than Bell's, and the figures for unions established since his study are lower still. Offices for Greak-letter organizations were primarily found in the largest unions (44%).

An *alumni office* was provided by only 15% of the unions, a drop from Bell's 32%. Smaller schools remained low with 5% and 12%, while the 5,000–9,999 group had 15% and the largest institutions more than doubled the average with 32%. Alumni offices took another turn downward when only 10% of the newer unions reported this facility, compared with 19% of the older unions.

Alumni lounges were found in only 9% of the unions, as in Bell's findings. Fourteen per cent of the largest schools had this facility. Continued decline was evident when comparing older and newer unions—from 10% to 8%. The general decline in providing alumni quarters, especially offices, is not surprising. More and more alumni groups have sought quarters in separate houses or in administration buildings. Playing little part in union fund raising in recent times, they no longer have claims to union space.

Religious-counselor offices were housed in 19% of the unions—just over Bell's 18%. The largest unions (12%) were much less likely to house such offices. Slightly fewer of the newer unions provided this facility than the older ones.

Forty-nine of the 52 unions housing religious counselors reported the number of offices they had (Table 174). Most had one office, while 22% had three or more.

A variety of *other kinds of offices* were written in—loan, placement, ombudsman, credit union. Such offices were listed only one, three or five times (Table 129). These data were too limited for interpretation.

As in Bell's study, separate office space for the *Associated Women Students* (AWS) was almost non-existent—only four such offices were reported in 1962, only one in 1971. Where AWS existed, it apparently was part of student government and shared its offices.

Eighty-eight per cent (246 unions) had *union-staff administrative and program offices*, compared with 78% in Bell's study. The percentage of unions with offices for administrative staff personnel was still increasing: 93% of the newer group had such offices, compared with 85% of the older group. But why the total did not even near 100% causes speculation. Either some unions (about 12%) were still operated from a dean's office or the business office or some of the respondents overlooked this listing when completing the questionnaire, which seems more likely in the largest unions (only 88% of which reported having administrative staff offices).

In an attempt to illuminate how many staff members are accommodated in union offices (since two or three staff members often share a single office this questionnaire asked for the *number of staff members* rather than number of offices which Bell's study asked). The numbers ranged from one to more than 10 (Table 176), with the number of staff members increasing, as expected, with enrollment. The smallest schools typically had one staff member (30%) or two (31%); the 2,500-4,999 schools had 2-4 (71%); the 5,000-9,999 group had 3-6 (55%); and the largest schools had either more than 10 (33%) or 5-6 (25%).

Twenty-two unions (8%) had *chapels*, and 5% (14) had meditation rooms. Size or type of school, or age of union had little bearing except that chapels were more frequent at rural-school unions (of which more are church-related) than others.

The remaining organization and administrative facilities were new listings in this study.

Forty-six per cent of the unions provided rooms specifically designed for *student-council or senate meetings*. All enrollment groups provided this facility fairly consistently. More than half the newer unions (56%) had such rooms, compared with 37% of the older group.

An office for *international-student clubs* was provided by 13% (35), which compares to Bell's 14%. The facility was found most frequently, of course, in unions in the two largest enrollment ranges, where more foreign students are enrolled. The newer unions, which include two-year-college unions (with no foreign students) and a high proportion of other small-school unions, had fewer international-club offices (10%) than the older group (14%).

Nine per cent of the unions provided *international centers* that include facilities like club rooms, information services and offices for advisors to students from other countries. Such centers, like international club offices, are found principally at larger schools. Incidence dropped sharply from 13% of the older unions to 4% of the newer group (which includes a higher proportion of smaller schools with few or no foreign students).

While the number of organizations (and offices) for foreign students is relatively small, there are numerous organizations for *other minority groups*, for which about a third (32%) of the unions provided offices, including the unions at school of fewer-than-2,500 (20%) and 2,500-4,999 (29%). At unions in the two largest enrollment groups, where more minority students are enrolled (and apparently more organizations exist), the percentages rose to 43% and 48%. The incidence of offices for minority groups dropped to 28% in newer unions and to 23% in rural schools, probably because there is a higher proportion of small schools in these two categories and hence fewer minority students—at least too few to form an organization that requires an office.

On the other hand, very few unions found it necessary, or for policy reasons, desirable, to provide *club rooms primarily for minority groups.* Only 15 unions (5%) had such facilities, and these were mainly at larger schools.

Apparently in conformance with common union policy of not providing separate club rooms or lounges for special student groups, few unions (again only 5%) provided *fraternity or sorority-chapter rooms* or lounges. These occurred mainly at unions in the two largest enrollment categories.

YMCA and YWCA, once commonly housed in unions, have virtually disappeared from union facilities (entirely so in the fewer-than-2,500 and 5,000-9,999 enrollment groups). Only 3% of all unions housed the YMCA and 1% housed the YWCA. Only one union in the newer group had a YMCA office and none had a YWCA office.

A *communications center,* a lobby area for activities like student-organization displays, sales and petitions, surprisingly was provided by two-thirds (67%) of the unions. Only unions at the smallest schools, where fewer organizations exist and communication is less difficult, showed less than the average incidence of communication centers.

Interview rooms for committee and job recruiting were provided by 35% (97). Substantially fewer of the largest unions (29%) had the facility than unions at smaller schools. Also, fewer of the urban schools (30%), which include many in the more-than-10,000 range, had interview rooms—possibly because the larger schools have special job-interview provisions elsewhere on their campuses. The older group, which includes more of the largest schools, more frequently (38%) had interview rooms than the newer group (32%).

Sixty per cent (166) of the unions provided *wall cases for promotional displays,* trophies and other items. Many more unions in the two large enrollment ranges (72% and 68%) had this facility than unions in the two smaller categories (48% and 56%)—again, very likely a reflection of unions' trying to deal with the communication problem on large campuses.

Stores and Other Facilities (Tables 129, 175)

Recent union planning appears to have placed *bookstores* among the predominant large union facilities. Three-fourths (208) of the unions had bookstore facilities, a considerable increase over Bell's 59%. While some of the older unions had undoubtedly added bookstores as they built additions in the last 10 years, the major increase was in the newer unions—85% had bookstores. This is partially because the newer group included a higher proportion of small-school unions, which, in Bell's study as well as this one, provided bookstores more frequently than the large-school unions. Fewer unions (69%) in rural schools, although they also included a high proportion of small schools, had bookstores than urban (75%) or suburban (81%) schools. A possible explanation is that some rural schools, having to rely on stores of their own, built stores before unions and kept the stores as separate operations.

One-hundred-thirty-four institutions responded to a question about the number of square feet in their bookstores (Table 175). The areas were increasing, compared with Bell's findings. For example, whereas 46% (highest) of the fewer-than-2,500 enrollment group had fewer than 1,500 square feet in Bell's study, 42% (also highest) had 2,501-5,000 square feet in this study. One-third of the 2,500-4,999 group had 1,501-2,500 square feet in Bell's study, and 32% had 2,501-5,000 square feet in this study. Thirty-five per cent of the 5,000-9,999 group had 5,001-7,500 square feet in Bell's study, and 42% had more than 10,000 square feet in this study. One-third of the largest schools had more than 10,000 square feet in Bell's study, and 60% had that much space in this study. The data do not indicate whether the area reported was gross square feet or net assignable square feet; future questionnaires should clarify this point.

Only 12 unions (4%) sold school supplies only—not text or trade books. More larger schools and older unions had such stores.

Guest-room facilities were provided in 16% (45) of the unions, comparable to Bell's 17%. The percentage of guest rooms remained constant in the two union-age groups, reflecting a change from the declining trend Bell found. Unions at larger schools provided most of these facilities—for example, 29% of those in the more-than-10,000 enrollment group provided guest rooms. The number of rural schools with guest rooms was high (20%), very possibly due to lack of overnight rooms for college guests nearby. Although only a few unions indicated how many guest rooms they had, most had 1-10. However, some larger schools had sizeable facilities.

Only 5%, or 13 unions, had separate *clothing-stores.*

Only two unions had *flower shops;* both were in the post-1962 group.

Eighteen unions (6%) had *gift shops* separate from their bookstores. They were well distributed except in the 2,500-4,999 group (2%) and the more-than-10,000 schools (14%). Fewer post-1962 unions (4%) provided gift shops than pre-1962 unions (9%).

A *central mailing* or duplicating room, which includes such services as mimeograph, offset, addressing and postage-metering machines, was housed in 68 unions (24%). Thirty per cent of the newer unions had this facility, compared with 20% of the older group. Otherwise, most percentages were near the average.

Twenty-two per cent (62 unions) had rooms available primarily for *study.* The incidence of study rooms was uniform throughout all categories, except that more than twice the average number of suburban unions (48%) had special study rooms.

*Adult-Conference or Adult-Education Facilities**
(Table 129)

This new section in the study indicated that at least 31% of the unions provided facilities primarily for adult-conference use (Table 129).

Most frequently provided were small conference rooms (31%), larger meeting and seminar rooms (27%), a registration-reception area (20%) and private dining rooms (18%). Other facilities (in order of frequency) were an information desk, a separate lobby-lounge, administrative offices, a checkroom and a conference auditorium.

---

*Primarily for Adult-Conference Use

Virtually all unions served adult-conference purposes to some degree, using facilities provided primarily for students and faculty. More unions at schools in the two larger enrollment ranges provided these facilities than the smaller-school unions. The difference in provisions by older and newer unions was slight.

Conclusions

Ten years ago Boris Bell searched for trends in providing at least certain basic union facilities. He reasoned that 15 years of union growth, closer definition of union goals and functions, and the greatly increased availability of union planning literature and professional help would result in more commonly adopted facilities than before. His expectation was fulfilled, but, as he pointed out, only moderately.

Thus, it was the responsibility of this study to determine trends toward a more common core of facilities. In addition, this study sought the number and kinds of facilities that are new since 1962, or which have increased or decreased in incidence (in percentage terms) as indications of possible trends that have developed during the past 10 years.

Bell's study listed 78 facilities, of which only 28 (36%) were common to at least half the participating unions. In comparison, 132 facilities were listed in this study, of which 33 (25%) were common to at least half the responding unions. So in the last 10 years there has been an increment of at least five facilities common to a majority of unions (even though the ratio of those common facilities to the total listed dropped from 36% to 25%). Further refinement of Bell's data showed that only 13 facilities were included in as many as three-fourths of the unions. Current data indicated that 13 facilities were still common to three-fourths of the 278 participating unions (including cafeteria, which bordered at 74%). Although bookstores replaced television rooms in this group, as Bell said, these 13 high-priority facilities appear to constitute a continuing core of union facilities. As noted, five more facilities than in Bell's study are shared by more than half the unions. However, since the overall list has grown from 78 to 132 facilities, the trend appears to be toward greater diversity, rather than commonality.

Five of the reasons Bell cited are pertinent to this study:

- Many unions cannot afford what they would like to have. (The larger, more affluent schools, for example, have 40 facilities in common, compared with 27 for the smallest schools.)

- Many of the 132 facilities listed in this study, especially offices for particular student or staff groups, are quite specialized and do not represent needs in most situations. The newly listed social and service facilities are just beginning to win interest.

- Many campuses already have certain facilities elsewhere.
- Many schools built their unions years ago and cannot readily add what they want or need now.
- Many respondents probably inadvertently skipped items on the questionnaire, filled it out hastily or were confused by its format.

In addition, the outcome of this survey was clouded by three facts: (1) that only 31.2% of the unions that received the questionnaire responded, compared with 37.5% in Bell's study, making the results less representative, (2) that half the unions responding in the Bell survey—many of them larger unions with a wide range of facilities—did not report in this survey, and (3) that this study included, for the first time, 33 two-year-college unions (12% of the respondents), many of which have very limited facilities (in kind).

In spite of these adverse factors (some of which also applied to Bell's study), tentative observations can be made:

- More and more schools are building bookstores—instead of ballrooms and bowling lanes. And the stores are larger.
- In spite of the avowed cultural purposes of unions and the evident interest of students, an increasing number of college planning committees and college administrators—mostly educators, ironically—are eliminating or postponing cultural facilities such as browsing rooms, music listening rooms, art galleries, craft shops. The one exception is an auditorium or theater. On the other hand, the provision of billiards rooms has sharply increased.
- In general, noticeably more unions are providing the following facilities than in 1962:

Billiards
Bookstore
Auditorium
Theater
Travel Agency
Staff Offices

Lockers
Vending Rooms
Campus Newspaper Office
Desk and File room for
Student Organizations

- Noticeably fewer unions are providing the following facilities:

Television Room
Barber shop
Laundry Pick-up

Card Room
Self-service Kitchenette
Parking area

Western Union service
Cafeteria
Restaurant (waiter service)
Craft Shop
Coat rooms and Checkrooms
Music Listening room
Browsing room
Art Gallery

- A number of the facilities listed for the first time are found fairly frequently in unions, both new and old.

  (Undoubtedly several of these facilities existed at unions in 1962, but no questions were asked about them.) The "new" facilities listed in this study that elicited substantial affirmative response were:

Communications Center, 67%
Outdoor Terrace, 62%
Student-Council Chamber, 46%
Powder Room for Women, 44%
Program Lounge, 42%
Coffee House, 36%
Office for Minority Organizations, 32%
Facilities primarily for Adult Conferences, 31%
Rooms for Study Primarily, 22%
Government Post Office Sub-Station, 22%
Print Shop, 20%

After citing the wide range of facilities that characterized the unions of this survey—which, of course, reflected special needs of given campuses—it is still worth noting that the number of facilities common to more than half the unions in every enrollment group except the 5,000-9,999 schools, where the number remained the same, was higher than in Bell's study—27 for the the fewer-than-2,500 schools (versus 20 in Bell's study), 32 for the 2,500-4,999 schools (versus 27), 39 for the 5,000-9,999 group (also 39) and 40 for the more-than-10,000 schools (versus 37).

To identify facilities provided by a majority of *all* unions in 1962 and in 1971, the following two lists were prepared:

1962 Results

Facilities	Percent of Unions Providing
Recreation	
Table Tennis Room	82
Billiard Room	79
Card Room	57
Social	
Lounge	82
Ballroom	72
Cultural-Hobby	
Television Room	83
Music Listening Room	70
Poster Room	59
Art Gallery	50

1962 Results

Facilities	Percent of Unions Providing
Meeting	
Committee Rooms	91
Meeting Rooms	79
Service	
Pay Telephones	94
Information Desk	87
Coat Room (unattended)	67
Parking Area	61
House Phones	52
Ticket Office	52
Food	
Snack Bar	89
Cafeteria	84
Banqueting Rooms	77
Private Dining Room	56
Organization-Activity	
Student Government Office	81
Union Board-Committee Office	65
Year Book Office	60
Organization Mail Boxes	59
General Work Room	57
Other	
Union Staff Administrative Offices	78
Bookstore	59

1972 Results

Facilities	Percent of Unions Providing
Recreation	
Billiard Room	91
Table Tennis	79
Social	
Lounge	89
Ballroom	73
Outdoor Terrace or Patio (for lounging, refreshments, outdoor social and music programming, etc.)	62

1972 Results

Facilities	Percent of Unions Providing
Cultural-Hobby	
Television Room	70
Music Room (Listening)	55
Corridor-Lobby Exhibition Space	54
Photo Dark Room	51
Poster Room	51
Meeting	
Meeting Rooms	88
Small Committee Rooms	84
Service	
Public (pay) Phones	95
Information Desk	88
House Phones	68
Lockers	59
Coat Room (unattended)	54
Parking Area	53
Ticket Office	50
Food	
Snack Bar	87
Banqueting	76
Cafeteria	74
Organization Facilities; Administrative Offices	
Union Staff Administrative and Program Office	88
Student Government Office	78
Mail Boxes for Organizations	67
Campus Newspaper Office	67
Union-Board-Committee Office	67
Communications Center (lobby area for student display, tables, sales, petitions)	67
Year Book Office	60
Wall Cases for Promotional displays, trophies, etc.	60
Filing facilities—organizations	56
Desk facilities—organizations	50
Other	
Bookstore	75

Section VIII: TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Two-year colleges, which include junior colleges, community colleges and two-year branch campuses, have experienced phenomenal growth in recent years. One objective has been to make a two-year-college education accessible to all capable of and interested in attending. As a result, many new two-year colleges open their doors each year.

This increase has provided new opportunities for the development of college unions. The purposes of this section are to provide insight into what is happening and to offer a means of comparing two-year-college unions with four-year-college unions.

Forty-two two-year colleges responded to the study. Because unions at nine schools were in the planning or construction stages, only 33 responses (12% of the 278 returns) were usable. An enrollment breakdown of the 33 two-year colleges follows:

Enrollment	*Respondents*
Under 2,500	17
2,500–4,999	11
5,000–9,999	4
Over 10,000	1

All were public institutions.

No comparisons were made between these two-year schools and those responding to Bell's study since only three two-year schools (2% of all respondents) were involved in his survey.

The 49 tables in this section (taken from the 176 in the first seven sections) were selected as the most pertinent to two-year colleges in hope that this information would be of most help to the two-year colleges planning buildings or establishing union operations. What is reflected in these tables, of course, is what the 33 two-year schools were doing in 1971. Because many of these unions were so new, the data may sometimes represent only temporary measures: therefore, the results are not necessarily what *should be* the practice or *will be* the practice but only what *was* the practice at the responding schools when the survey was taken.

MAJOR DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

I. Physical Plant (Tables TW 1-9)

In the 32 schools responding to the building-status question (Table TW 1), a majority of unions (72%) were operating in their original buildings. Six unions (19%) had only one addition, and two schools had replaced their original buildings.

Gross square footage of the total physical plant then in use is shown in Table TW 2. Of 27 respondents, 21 (78%) operated in buildings of less than 50,000 gross square feet; 14 (52%) had less than 30,000 gross square feet. The largest number of returns (14) came from schools in the fewer-than-2,500 enrollment bracket, and nine of these had less than 30,000 square feet. More complete statistics are in Table TW 9, which lists each college's full-time enrollment and building size.

Only 23 schools gave the cost of constructing their original union building plus additions, exclusive of furnishings, equipment and fees (Table TW 3). Although construction costs were widespread—from less than $250,000 to more than $2 million—the most frequent categories were: more than $2 million—six colleges (26%), $500,000-749,999—six colleges (26%) and less than $250,000—four colleges (17%). The wide range of costs is due not only to varying sizes of buildings but also to the fact that construction costs span a 13-year period (one union was built in 1939).

Twenty-one schools gave the square-foot construction costs of their original buildings (Table TW 4). These are reported in the table as a record of unit-cost ranges in the 1960s, rather than a guideline for the present or future. Fifteen indicated costs of more than $20 per square foot, and 10 schools (49%) reported costs from $26 to more than $30.

Most two-year colleges are tax-supported institutions. In contrast to four-year public institutions, however, construction of their unions is mainly financed through city, county or state appropriations (Table TW 5). This was true for 64% (14) of the two-year-college unions compared with 20% of the unions at four-year public schools. Of the 14, 10 said more than 90% of the cost came from city, county or state appropriations. Only three of the 22 respondents to this question received federal loans and only four used revenue bonds.

Of the 16 responding colleges in Table TW 6, most used consultants in some aspect of building planning. Twelve schools (75%) used interior design consultants, 11 (69%) used general-building planning consultants, 10 (63%) used bookstore consultants and only three (19%) used food service layout consultants. A greater percentage of two-year colleges used interior and general planning consultants than did *all* unions in this study, but considerably fewer used bookstore and food service consultants.

Sixteen schools were planning union expansion (Table TW 7), but only 10 estimated size and cost of expansion. Five estimated union expansion at less than 25,000 square feet and three at 25,000-49,999 square feet. Estimated construction costs were spread rather evenly from less than $250,000 to more than $2 million.

The following table indicates the chronological development of the two-year-college unions:

Time period	*No. of Unions*
1936-1945	1
1958-1962	6
1963-1968	13
1969-1973	13

These figures (Table TW 8) illuminate the fact that two-year-college unions are a comparatively recent development. Only seven were constructed before 1962, while 26 opened, or were scheduled to open, since 1963—13 of them since 1968. As noted, this element of *newness* (along with relatively small school and union building size) had a significant bearing on the results of the survey.

II. Organizational Structure

POLICY-MAKING BODY (Tables 10-13)

Of the 33 respondents, 22 had policy-making bodies (Table TW 10), while five indicated their student governments served as the policy making bodies and six had no policy-making body. Twenty policy-making bodies (91%) included representatives of student government (compared with 78% of *all* unions), illustrating the primary role of student government in most matters of student interest at two-year colleges. Other principal groups represented were union staff (68%), student affairs dean (55%), union board or program (50%) and faculty (50%). Generally, student involvement resulted from an election, while student affairs and union staff members were usually appointed or served in an ex-officio capacity. Six of 17 respondents in Table TW 11 (37%) indicated that the policy-making body was responsible to the student-affairs dean (compared with 15% of all unions) and five (29%) answered to the union staff.

A variety of systems was used to provide chairmen for policy-making bodies (Table TW 12). In an almost equal number of the 18 unions reporting, the chairman came from the union staff, union program board, administration or faculty or student government.

The policy-making body met most frequently on a weekly (39%) or a monthly basis (33%).

PROGRAM BOARD (Tables TW 14-17)

Twenty of the 33 responding two-year colleges (60%) had some form of union program board (Table TW 14). Membership consisted primarily, as expected, of students. The general student body was represented on three-fourths of the boards, the student chairmen of program committees on three-fourths and student government on 70% (compared with 37% for *all* unions). Most students were elected. Union staff was represented on 18 boards (90%) and generally served in an ex-officio capacity. In three schools the program board and policy-making board were the same, and seven had no program board.

The program board was usually responsible either to student government (40%) or to the union staff (36%, Table TW 15). Fourteen per cent were responsible to a combined union staff-student government authority. This is all in contrast to the results for *all* unions, for which the line of responsibility was most often (26%) to the union policy board.

A majority of the unions (69%) did not compensate program board members. Compensations given are listed in Table TW 16. Thirteen unions (52%) gave no awards to program board members (Table TW 17); 12 (48%) gave awards, usually certificates or plaques.

PROGRAM COMMITTEES (Tables TW 18-20)

Two-thirds of the unions (22) answered the question on program committees. Forty-five per cent (10) had 1-5 committees, 22% had six committees and 14% had seven. This is substantially lower, as might be expected at smaller schools, than the median of seven committees for *all* unions. Only one union had no program committees. Seventeen of 18 respondents (94%) said the average number of students per program committee was 1-10 (Table TW 19).

Table TW 20 lists the variety of program committees in 20 two-year-college unions. The most frequently found general program functions were:

Committee	*Respondents*	*Percentage*
Social, Dance	20	100%
Lecture, Forum	13	65
Visual Arts, Exhibitions	12	60
Film	12	60
Special Events	12	60
Publicity, Public Relations	11	55

The main emphasis of the above committees was social. One must add the performing arts committees (8) to lecture-forum (13) and visual arts (12)—totalling 33—if the number of culturally oriented committees is to equal the number of social committees [social, dance (20) and special events (12)], which is in sharp contrast to the predominance of culturally oriented committees among *all* unions.

Generally program committees met weekly (40%); only 10% had no regular schedule. Thirty-five per cent of the individual committees met weekly, and 40% had no regular schedule.

III. Professional Staff (Tables TW 22-30)

All 33 schools reported how many professional union staff members they employed (Table TW 22). Most (58%, or 19) had only one professional staff member, while eight (24%) had two, and five (15%) had three. An enrollment breakdown of those with one staff member follows: fewer-than-2,500—11 schools; 2,500-4,999—six schools; 5,000-9,999—two schools. The one institution with more than 10,000 enrolled had three professional staff members. Unions with more than one staff member had: administrative assistants—four; assistant directors—three; food managers—two. Comparing these data with Table 47 for *all* unions, it is apparent that two-year-college unions had substantially fewer professional staff members than unions at four-year schools of similar size.

Educational backgrounds of union directors are listed in Table TW 23. Twenty-six (81%) of the 32 respondents indicated a master's degree was the highest earned by directors, compared with 63% of *all* union directors.* Three had bachelor's degrees, and three had doctorates. The most common fields of preparation were student personnel (10 directors) and guidance and counseling (seven directors). Because preparation in these two fields is often similar these fields can be combined, totalling 17 directors (53%) with student-personnel-service preparation, compared with 26% of directors at four-year schools. No union directors at two-year schools had business preparation. The three directors with doctorates were at schools with enrollments of fewer-than 2,500. This suggests that for the most part the union at two-year colleges either is part of the dean of students' operation or is supervised by the dean himself.

Thirty-one institutions reported the functions of the director (Table TW 24). In contrast to the directors of *all* unions (Table 51), directors of two-year-college unions were more involved in student programs and activities (100% compared to 91% of *all* union directors) and much less involved in general building services (68% versus 87%), food service (35% versus 48%) and building maintenance (32% versus 75%)—even much less involved than union directors at fewer-than-2,500 schools.

---

*This difference is probably due to the fact that more two-year-college union directors also serve as deans of students or assistant deans of students.

Involvement in the operation of recreation facilities was about the same (84% compared to 86% of *all* union directors). So, directors of two-year-college unions appeared to be primarily activity or program directors, with others managing business functions in about two-thirds of the unions.

It is therefore logical that union directors at two-year schools normally reported to the student affairs dean (85%), as Table TW 25 indicates.

A wide range of *non-union* functions was listed by directors at two-year institutions (Table TW 26). The director was often responsible for two or more areas other than the union. Typical areas reported by the 27 respondents were student activities coordination (22%), special events-scheduling master calendar (15%) and student financial aids (15%). In addition, 11% had teaching, coaching, student-counseling, placement-service and housing responsibilities. Because many directors were titled Director of Student Activities, their main *union* function was student activities direction, and the union appeared to be, in effect, one of several student activities under their jurisdiction and, therefore, a part-time responsibility.

Most directors, 26 of 30 (87%), had held their present position fewer than five years; 14 (47%) held their positions two years or less (Table 27).

Thirteen of 30 directors (43%), had held no other union positions (Table TW 28). Of the remaining 17 respondents, eight (27%) had held subordinate union positions at other colleges, three (10%) had held subordinate positions at their present colleges and seven (23%) had been union directors at other colleges.

Education was the most frequent field of previous non-union employment of union directors (17 of 18 respondents). Table TW 30 takes this topic a step further. Of 30 respondents, 12 (40%) had held no non-union positions, nine (30%) had held one previous position and six (20%) had held two non-union positions.

IV. Financial Operation (Tables 31-36)

Of the 33 schools reporting about union fees, 14 (43%) had no separate union fee and four had an activity program fee only (Table TW 31). In other words, 55% of the two-year colleges had no union fee as such, compared with 22% of the four-year colleges having no union fee. Six schools (18%) had a combined building amortization and operation fee. Only 11 schools had a fee paid on a semester basis (Table TW 32). The fees ranged from $2 to $40 per semester, with no significant clustering.

Twenty-nine colleges reported about food service as a union revenue-providing department (Table TW 33). Food-service operations at two-year schools were most often supervised by institutional caterers on a contract basis (48%) and by the general college dining service (34%)—similar to unions at fewer-than-2,500 schools. Thirteen schools (68%) indicated food service operations were entirely self-supporting, 64% were expected to contribute profits to the total union operation and one (7%) paid a space rental—smaller percentages than for *all* unions, even for the fewer-than-2,500 enrollment group. Twenty-nine schools reported on methods of purchasing in the food service area. As expected, in 38% of them, purchasing was handled by the institutional caterer, and in 34% by the college dining service. The fewer-than-2,500 group was a dominating factor in these results, as in all the two-year-college tabulations.

Information on bookstore operations was given by 30 unions (Table TW 34). A majority of 18 (60%) said their bookstores were operated by their college business offices (compared with 49% of the four-year unions). Bookstore operations were entirely self-supporting in 84% of the unions. Of 17 respondents, 41% said bookstore operations were expected to give a percentage of profits to the union and 18% paid a space rental to the union—indicating 59% of the two-year-college unions benefited financially from store operations, compared with 65% of *all* unions.

Concessions were a common method of creating union revenue among the 30 respondents to this inquiry (Table TW 35), indicating 10 concessions (compared with 23 for *all* unions). Concessions most often reported were: vending machines (100%); juke boxes (73%); vending machines elsewhere on campus (50%); pin-ball machines (37%); and telephones (30%). These concessions were mainly operated on a commission basis. Profits usually went to the total union operation, except for telephones and vending machines elsewhere on campus, whose profits were diverted elsewhere.

Of the 16 other union revenue-producing departments discussed in Section IV, 11 were shared by two-year schools (Table TW 36). The leading ones were: games (19 unions), movies (18), programs (17), general services/merchandise desk (13) and recreation-equipment rentals (6). Games (74%) and recreation-equipment rentals (83%) were largely self-supporting, while movies (89%), programs (88%) and merchandise desk (62%) were usually subsidized. Any profits generally went to the total union operation; only parking-lot fees were not given to the union.

V. General Union Policies (Tables 37–47)

The two-year colleges, like the four-year colleges, used other campus facilities in presenting their union programs. Twenty-four (80%) of 30 respondents said other college facilities supplemented the union's facilities (Table TW 37). Only six unions (20%) said their programs were held entirely within the union. The facilities most commonly used to supplement unions were (Table TW 38): field house, gym or coliseum (57%); classrooms-lecture halls (39%); theater (30%); and auditorium (30%).

When discussing *all* unions in this study (Table 99), a wider variety of campus facilities was used, presumably because of the greater resources of the four-year colleges, and classroom-lecture halls were used much less (15%), probably because of the greater adequacy of the unions' own meeting rooms.

Thirty-one institutions responded to the question about responsibility for union program planning and execution (Table TW 39). A coordinated effort by the program board, committees and staff (84%) was most often used, although staff-only and student government were more frequently responsible than in the four-year-college unions.

The total costs for free union programs were spread from $1,000 to more than $50,000 (Table TW 40). Similarly, costs of free union programs per full-time day student varied dramatically—from less than $1 to more than $20 (Table TW 41). No pattern was apparent. Either there was no common practice or what constitutes the "cost of union free programs" was widely misinterpreted. (For example, some may have included everything funded by a general activity fee, including publications and athletics.)

In an overwhelming majority, 30 of 31 unions (97%), the maintenance staff was primarily responsible to the college maintenance department (Table TW 42), in sharp contrast with the general situation in which most maintenance staffs of *all* unions were responsible to the college maintenance department in only 53% of the schools.

Salaries of the maintenance staff were charged to the general college budget in 52% of the schools (14 of 27 respondents, Table TW 43). Twenty-six per cent charged salaries to the maintenance department, while only 7% (two schools) charged the union. Again, the situation was reversed among *all* unions; 52% of all unions in this study paid for maintenance salaries.

Of 26 colleges, 92% said maintenance supplies were furnished by the college maintenance department, and only 8% reported supplies were furnished by the union (Table TW 44). These figures contrast those of *all* unions: 42% and 58%, respectively.

Seventeen of 25 two-year respondents (68%) reported that repairs were paid for by the college maintenance department, while only six (24%) said the union paid for repairs (Table TW 45), compared with 66% of *all* unions.

The above figures on maintenance indicate the great dependence of the two-year-college union on other departments.

At least some two-year colleges, but generally not as high a percentage, offered the same wide variety of miscellaneous services as listed in Table 118 for *all* unions. The miscellaneous services most often found in the two-year-college unions (Table TW 46) were general campus information (94%), bulletin board space (91%), master calendar of campus events (91%) and personal-notices board (84%). Lost-and-found department, ticket sales, mail boxes for student organizations and sign- and poster-making were found in three-fourths of the unions.

Seventeen unions loaned equipment for use outside the union building (Table TW 47). Most frequently loaned were tables (71%), chairs (65%), public-address equipment (59%) and recreation equipment (53%). Also loaned were movie-slide projectors, kitchen utensils, lighting equipment and office machines.

VI. Facilities (Table TW 48)

Table TW 48, ***Union Building Facilities***, comprises the same 10 categories for two-year-college unions as Table 129 for *all* unions. Although it also classified schools by enrollment, comparing them is not attempted here since most were in the two smaller enrollment ranges. The most frequently occurring facilities in each category are listed below:

RECREATION—Billiard room (76%), table tennis (73%) and card room (48%).

SOCIAL FACILITIES—Lounge (85%), outdoor terrace or patio (61%) and program lounge (55%).

CULTURAL-HOBBY—A separate enclosed gallery (36%) and corridor-lobby exhibition area (33%) were the exhibit areas primarily used. Thirty-six per cent used poster rooms and television rooms.

MEETING—Meeting rooms (79%) and small committee rooms (76%) were among the most frequently reported of all facilities.

SERVICE—Public (pay) phones (88%), information desk (64%), parking area (84%) and house phones (39%).

FOOD—Snack bar (78%), cafeteria (61%) and vending-machine room (55%).

COMMUTER—Lockers and lounges (24% each). This small response may indicate that two-year colleges, which are predominantly attended by commuters, consider their entire union facility as being especially for commuters and do not provide many separate facilities.

ORGANIZATION-ACTIVITY—Student-government office (73%), student-council or senate chamber (67%), mail boxes for organizations (61%) and campus-newspaper and communication center (58% each).

OTHER—Union-staff administration and program offices (88%). It is not clear where administrative offices were in the remaining 12%, unless they were in the dean's office in another building. Bookstores apparently were a top-priority union facility among the two-year colleges: 76% had them.

ADULT CONFERENCE-EDUCATION—Small conference rooms (33%) and larger meeting and seminar rooms (24%). Otherwise, special facilities for adult conferences were minimal. When or if two-year colleges sponsored adult conferences, most apparently held them in class buildings, not in the union.

To give a better view of a possible core of facilities among two-year colleges, facilities shared by more than half the 33 respondents are listed, in descending order, in Table TW 49. Also shown are the percentages of *all* unions, two-year and four-year combined, providing the same facility. Except in three instances, (bookstore, program lounge and vending room), a higher percentage of *all* unions had the facility than did the two-year-college unions.

In "other" key facilities (listed in the second section of the table), a substantially higher percentage of *all* unions provided each facility listed than did the two-year-college unions, except in five cases. Offices for union committees, television room, social facilities like ballroom and party room, and all cultural and hobby facilities (except art gallery) were, comparatively, found in conspicuously few two-year-college unions.

Conclusions

The appearance of many two-year-college unions in this survey for the first time, illustrates a rapidly increasing growth rate for two-year colleges. The 33 usable respondents (of about 90 two-year colleges that hold memberships in the Association) represented 15 states and had enrollments ranging from 574 students to more than 10,000, with a median enrollment of 2,400. So the results are probably representative.

From the data received, a profile of the two-year-college union as it existed in 1971 emerges. The two-year colleges in this study were all public, and most of the unions had been built since 1963 (26 of the 33). The average two-year-college union was a building of slightly under 30,000 gross square fee, costing about $650,000, and was financed primarily with public funds (64% of the unions).

The building usually included a lounge, snack bar (and possibly a cafeteria, though not necessarily), meeting rooms, bookstore, billiards and table tennis, and student and staff offices.

Few had social facilities—except that snack bars served as informal social centers—or cultural facilities, other than art galleries (Table 46).

Of the 33 colleges, 22 unions had a separate *policy-making board*. Where there was a separate union policy board, it was responsible in almost every instance to either the student-affairs dean, union staff or student government, and the chairman was likely to be a representative of the administration, student government or union staff.

Forty per cent of the unions had no *program* planning board. Where one existed, membership was dominated by student representatives with elected members in three-fourths the unions. The board was typically responsible either to student government or to the union staff.

Again, almost 40% of the unions had no programming *committees*. Where they existed, there were usually one to seven committees that were concerned mainly with social and dance events (100%), lectures and forums (65%), films (60%), special events like homecoming and freshman orientation (65%), fine arts programs and exhibitions (60%), and publicity and public relations (55%).

Forty-eight per cent of the unions had only one professional staff member to develop a social-cultural program and to manage the physical plant and all its services. Directors most frequently had master's degrees; the most prevalent field of preparation was from the student personnel services area. The professional staff member, more likely than not, also had other assignments outside the union: teaching, general student activities coordination, housing supervision, student-financial aids administration or coaching. In 85% of the schools, he reported to the student affairs dean.

Most union funds and support were supplied from the general college budget—55% of the unions did not have a special union student fee for operation and maintenance purposes.

Of the revenue-producing areas, food-service in about half the unions was managed by a private institutional caterer and in another third by the college dining service. They were generally self-supporting and were expected (70%) to contribute profits to the total union operation, or at least pay space rental, whoever the manager.

The bookstore was also usually managed separately under the direction of the college business office (60%) and was entirely self-supporting (84%). About 60% of the colleges either paid space rental or gave profits to the union.

A summary of the facilities data shows these unions reported, collectively, 108 kinds of facilities. Of this total, 18 facilities were included in at least half of all unions. Only eight facilities were common to three-fourths or more unions.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING FUTURE SURVEYS

The results of this study indicate increased growth and complexity of college union operations. A larger number of complete responses to the questionnaire would have enabled more accurate comparisons and discernment of trends. Several items should be considered about the present information and future implications of a similar study.

It was felt originally that the questionnaire could be divided into seven sections and a different person could analyze the data for a given section. It was later realized that this was inoperable for the following reasons:

a. possible trouble locating seven different people willing to take assignments.

b. results might not be computed and returned at the same time by all seven people—this could result in a delay of months for one or two sections

c. each person would have to be instructed as to how to tabulate the results and some might not have excess to a computer

d. since the sections would be sent out separately, some unions might respond to one section and not another, therefore, results of each section could be of different unions—there would not be a picture of how a union operates as in total

The length and format of the questionnaire probably encouraged only partial responses and discouraged several from responding. Obviously, complete data are necessary, but without such a cumbersome document. Thus, it would seem revision and shortening of the questionnaire is necessary to accommodate a more complete return ratio. The authors and Mr. Porter Butts[1] suggest the following revisions:

---

[1] With his years of experience as Editor of Publications, and familiarity with the questionnaires and surveys of the 1962 and 1971 studies, Mr. Butts has provided substantial assistance in the formulation of the revisions.

1. Elimination of all questions of minor importance and of all items which are not to be reported on in the published findings.
2. Re-formulation of the questions so that as many as possible can be responded to by a check mark or circling a number—this, in turn, making machine tabulation much more feasible.
3. Elimination of all questions concerning information which changes rapidly and therefore is of only temporary value (and probably obsolete by the time the survey results are distributed)—such as price and rate information, building costs per square foot, net square footage of usable space, number of maintenance positions, loan of equipment, etc.
4. Up-dating of the listing of facilities, services, and practices to include those of current interest, whether appearing in pervious surveys or not, and the elimination of those known to be rather obsolete, or checked by, say, less than 5% of the unions responding in the 1971 survey.
5. Clear indication that *total* enrollment, including full time graduate students, is wanted. (In the 1971 survey, only the undergraduate enrollment was used to determine enrollment categories, which probably resulted in a number of unions (and their data) being included in a smaller enrollment bracket than warranted, and thus unduly influencing all results shown by size of school enrollment.) Also, the breakdown of enrollments should be divided into several categories beyond the 'Over 10,000' bracket. (many schools have enrollments much larger than this, and it would be worthwhile to divide them up for meaningful interpretation)
6. A pre-test, or pilot, study among a dozen unions and members of the Research Committee to identify sources or misunderstanding or confusion, leading to re-phrasing, simplification, or omission of certain questions.

To aid in expediting the tabulation of results, and to make the tables shorter and more readable or meaningful, the following suggestions are made:

1. Elimination from the tables of the "public and private school" and "urban, suburban, rural school" categories except where the 1971 study showed these institutional characteristics to make a truly significant difference. The substitution (in place of the above categories) of "two-year colleges"—on the assumption many more two-year colleges will be included in the next survey—so that results for two-year colleges can be readily compared with four-year colleges (the master table of results would be for four-year colleges only,

not *all* colleges combined), and total results readily determines.

2. The elimination of separate tabulations for individual office and other specialized or miscellaneous facilities, services rendered, etc., except for the principal ones (i.e., those checked by 10% or more of the unions in the 1971 survey), showing such miscellaneous and unique facilities under "Other" and footnoting what, typically, "Other" includes.
3. Smaller dollar intervals for student fee data, to be more meaningful.
4. Re-formulation of a number of questions, adding the instruction "check only *one*—the primary one," to avoid multiple answers which make the response not usable.
5. Clarification of a number of questions (i.e., in the case of organization structure what is meant by "election" vs. "appointment," and by "responsible to" vs. "advisory to").
6. And most important of all, the redesign of the questionnaire so that most of the responses can be tabulated by machine (instead of by hand, as in the case of all previous surveys).

The recent and predicted growth rate for two-year colleges and their unions is high and the findings of this study may have only touched the surface. Another complete, and possibly separate, study of the two-year college unions only could be made before the overall study is started again, possibly in three to five years. But if done at the same time as a general survey, results for two-year colleges should be segregated and shown separately from the four-year colleges, for comparative purposes and in order not to condition and modify the results for either group of institutions, each of which is interested in the practices and policies of their two- or four-year counterparts.

If all these proposals are to be implemented and provide complete statistical information, one essential ingredient would seem apparent—complete participation from the membership of ACU-I. This is the only way in which to conduct a reliable and more meaningful study of the administration and operation of the college union. Every effort should be made to obtain at least a 50% response so that one can be reasonably accurate and confident in saying "This is what a majority of four-year (or two-year) college unions report."

APPENDIX

Section 1

Physical Plant

Table 1. Building Status
(278 Institutions Responding)

Building Status	No. of Schools	% of Schools
Operating Original Building Only	150	54
Have One Addition	72	26
Have Two Additions	21	8
Have Three Additions	8	4
Have Four Additions	4	1
Have Five Additions	2	—
Have Replaced Original Building	18	6
Original Building & Satellite	3*	1
TOTALS	278	100

*1 with [illegible] additions plus satellite
2 with 1 addition plus satellite

*Table 2. Size of Total Physical Plant, by Enrollment**
(262 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
Gross	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
Sq. Footage	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 30,000	37	14	26	33	7	9	3	6	1	2
30,000-49,999	39	15	21	27	12	20	3	6	3	5
50,000-74,999	50	19	19	24	17	26	13	24	1	2
75,000-99,999	31	12	8	10	14	21	6	11	3	5
100,000-124,999	29	11	1	1	10	15	11	20	7	11
125,000-149,999	19	7	2	3	3	5	7	13	7	11
150,000-174,999	14	5	1	1	1	1.5	6	11	6	9
175,000-199,999	17	6	—	—	1	1.5	4	7	12	18
200,000-224,999	5	2	—	—	—	—	1	2	4	6
225,000-249,999	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	8
250,000-274,999	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	8
275,000-300,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over 300,000	11	5	—	—	1	1.5	—	—	10	15
TOTALS	262		78		66		54		64	

*Includes temporary quarters as well as new buildings
Unknown—16

*Table 3. Original Construction Costs of Total Physical Plant Including Additions**
(227 Institutions Responding)

Construction Cost	Total Unions	% of Unions
Under $250,000	6	3
$250,000-499,999	11	5
$500,000-749,999	16	7
$750,000-999,999	19	8
$1,000,000-1,249,999	12	5
$1,250,000-1,499,999	13	6
$1,500,000-1,749-999	15	7
$1,750,000-1,999,999	15	7
$2,000,000-2,249,999	12	5
$2,250,000-2,499,999	3	1
$2,500,000-2,999,999	24	11
$3,000,000-3,499,999	20	9
$3,500,000-3,999,999	17	7
$4,000,000-4,499,999	10	4
$4,500,000-4,999,999	9	4
$5,000,000-5,999,999	7	3
$6,000,000-6,999,999	5	2
$7,000,000-7,999,999	4	2
$8,000,000-8,999,999	2	1
$9,000,000-10,000,000	2	1
Over $10,000,000	5	2
TOTALS	227	

*Costs are costs of construction, ranging over past 76 years. These costs are typically for construction only, exclusive of furnishings, equipment, and fees.

*Table 4. Construction Costs of New Buildings, 1963–1972, By Enrollment**

(138 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Construction Cost	No.	%				
Under $250,000	3	2	2	1	—	—
$250,000-499,999	8	6	5	2	—	1
$500,000-749,999	10	7	9	—	—	1
$750,000-999,999	8	6	3	3	2	—
$1,000,000-1,249,999	15	11	9	—	4	2
$1,250,000-1,499,999	8	6	4	4	—	—
$1,500,000-1,749,999	14	10	9	3	1	1
$1,750,000-1,999,999	5	3	2	1	2	—
$2,000,000-2,249,999	8	6	3	2	1	2
$2,250,000-2,499,999	2	1	—	—	1	1
$2,500,000-2,999,999	14	10	3	7	2	2
$3,000,000-3,499,999	12	9	4	3	5	—
$3,500,000-3,999,999	9	7	1	4	3	1
$4,000,000-4,499,999	5	4	—	1	—	4
$4,500,000-4,999,999	3	2	1	1	—	1
$5,000,000-5,999,999	7	5	—	1	2	4
$6,000,000-6,999,999	2	1	—	—	—	2
$7,000,000-7,999,999	—	—	—	—	—	—
$8,000,000-8,999,999	1	1	—	1	—	—
$9,000,000-10,000,000	1	1	—	—	—	1
Over $10,000,000	3	2	—	—	—	3
TOTALS	138		55	34	23	26

*These costs are typically for construction only, exclusive of furnishings, equipment and fees.

*Table 5. Square Foot Construction Costs of New Buildings, 1963-1972**
(132 Institutions Responding)

Cost	Unions Number	 Per Cent
Under $10.00	—	—
$10-11.99	6	4.5
$12-13.99	1	1
$14-15.99	4	3
$16-17.99	2	2
$18-19.99	8	6
$20-21.99	14	11
$22-23.99	15	11
$24-25.99	8	6
$26-27.99	14	11
$28-29.99	8	6
$30-34.99	15	11
$35-39.99	23	17
$40-44.99	6	4.5
$45-49.99	3	2
Over $50.00	5	4
TOTALS	132	

*Exclusive of furnishings and fees. No sq. ft. construction cost for 6 buildings.

*Table 6. Construction Costs of **Additions** 1963-1972, by Enrollment**
(77 Institutions Responding)

Construction Cost	Total Unions		Enrollment			
	No.	%	Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Under $250,000	7	9	4	2	1	—
$250,000-499,999	8	10	1	3	3	1
$500,000-749,999	9	12	2	1	3	3
$750,000-999,999	6	8	1	1	3	1
$1,000,000-1,249,999	7	9	1	—	3	3
$1,250,000-1,499,999	6	8	1	1	2	2
$1,500,000-1,749,999	6	8	—	1	3	2
$1,750,000-1,999,999	3	4	1	—	2	—
$2,000,000-2,249,999	4	5	—	—	1	3
$2,250,000-2,499,999	3	4	—	—	2	1
$2,500,000-2,999,999	6	8	—	1	3	2
$3,000,000-3,499,999	5	6	—	—	1	4
$3,500,000-3,999,999	3	4	—	1	1	1
$4,000,000-4,499,999	2	2.5	—	—	—	2
$4,500,000-4,999,999	—	—	—	—	—	—
$5,000,000-7,000,000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over $7,000,000	2	2.5	—	—	—	2
TOTALS	77		11	11	28	27

*If more than one addition at an institution, they were added together and figured as one. 6 unions had 2 additions, and 1 union had 3 additions.

*Table 7. Square Foot Construction Cost of **Additions** 1963-1972**
(70 Institutions Responding)

Cost	Unions	
	Number	Per Cent
Under $10.00	2	3
$10-11.99	1	1
$12-13.99	2	3
$14-15.99	5	7
$16-17.99	3	4
$18-19.99	4	6
$20-21.99	8	12
$22-23.99	9	13
$24-25.99	1	1
$26-27.99	5	7
$28-29.99	4	6
$30-34.99	5	7
$35-39.99	12	17
$40-44.99	3	4
$45-49.99	2	3
Over $50.00	4	6
TOTALS	70	

*Exclusive of Furnishings and fees. No.sq. ft. construction cost for 7 additions.

*Table 8. Financing of **Original** Building Construction of **Public** Institutions, By Source of Funds and Percentage (145 Institutions Responding)*

Source	Total Unions Using Source		% of Cost Financed by Source Indicated						
	No.	%	0–15%	16–30%	31–45%	46–60%	61–75%	76–90%	91–100%
Union Fee Accumulations	35	24	7	4	2	1	—	—	21
City, County or State Appropriations	39	27	4	3	3	—	2	1	26
Large Gift	18	12	7	5	—	—	—	—	6
General Subscription	17	12	3	4	—	4	2	2	2
College Funds	22	15	6	4	3	2	2	—	5
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	8	6	1	1	2	1	—	—	3
HUD or HHFA	11	8	1	—	2	1	1	2	4
Revenue Bonds	53	37	2	5	1	4	9	7	25
Bank, Mortgage or Other Private Loan	9	6	1	3	1	—	—	—	4
State Loan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	7	5	4	2	1	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	1	.6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other*	10	7	1	4	—	1	—	—	4

*Other includes fund drives, private bond issue, faculty club, state bond issue, and bookstore net reserve.

*Table 9. Financing of **Original** Building Construction at **Private** Institutions, By Source of Funds and Percentage (73 Institutions Responding)*

	Total Unions Using Source		% of Cost Financed by Source Indicated						
			0-15%	16-30%	31-45%	46-60%	61-75%	76-90%	91-100%
Source	No.	%							
Union Fee Accumulations	11	15	5	3	—	—	1	—	2
City, County or State Appropriations	3	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
Large Gift	30	41	6	2	2	6	2	1	11
General Subscription	9	12	4	2	2	—	—	—	1
College Funds	27	37	3	6	5	3	2	1	7
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	4	5	—	—	—	1	1	1	1
HUD or HHFA	19	26	—	1	4	2	7	—	5
Revenue Bonds	11	15	—	2	2	2	5	—	—
Bank, Mortgage or Other Private Loan	13	18	1	1	1	1	3	2	4
State Loan	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other*	3	4	—	2	1	—	—	—	—

*Other includes N.Y. state dorm. authority, alumni and campus store donation, and church.

*Table 10 Financing of **Original** Building at Additional **Public** and **Private** Institutions, by Source of Funds—but Percent Derived From Each Source Not Given**

(48 Institutions Responding)

Source	Total Unions Using Source No.	%	Public	Private
Union Fee Accumulations	18	38	16	2
City, County or State Appropriations	7	15	6	1
Large Gift	17	36	12	5
General Subscription	10	21	8	2
College Funds	19	40	13	6
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	4	8	4	—
HUD or HHFA	6	13	3	3
Revenue Bonds	13	27	13	—
Bank, Mortgage or Other Private Loan	4	8	1	3
State Loan	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	2	4	2	—
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	—	—	—	—
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—
Other*	1	2	1	—

*This chart is based only on those unions that did not fill out percentages. It provides some indication of the source used.

Table 11. Financing of Original Building **Furniture** and **Equipment** at **Public** Institutions, By Source of Funds and Percentage
(98 Institutions Responding)

Source	Total Unions Using Source		% of Cost Financed by Source Indicated						
	No.	%	0-15%	16-30%	31-45%	46-60%	61-75%	76-90%	91-100%
Union Fee Accumulations	22	22	—	—	—	1	—	—	21
City, County or State Appropriations	27	28	1	1	—	1	2	—	22
Large Gift	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	1	4
General Subscription	4	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	3
College Funds	13	13	3	1	1	—	—	—	8
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	5	5	—	—	2	—	—	—	3
HUD or HHFA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Revenue Bonds	26	27	1	1	—	1	2	—	21
Bank Mortgage or Other Private Loan	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
State Loan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other*	4	4	—	—	—	1	—	—	3

*Other includes state bond, bookstore earnings.

*Table 12. Financing of Original Building **Furniture** and **Equipment** at **Private** Institutions, By Source of Funds and Percentage*

(58 Institutions Responding)

Source	Total Unions Using Source		% of Cost Financed by Source Indicated						
	No.	%	0-15%	16-30%	31-45%	46-60%	61-75%	76-90%	91-100%
Union Fee Accumulations	6	10	1	1	—	—	—	—	4
City, County or State Appropriations	3	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
Large Gift	21	36	2	1	—	2	1	—	15
General Subscription	5	9	2	1	—	—	—	—	2
College Funds	21	36	—	—	1	2	—	2	16
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	3	5	1	—	—	—	—	—	2
HUD or HHFA	2	3	—	—	1	—	1	—	—
Revenue Bonds	5	9	—	—	—	—	3	—	2
Bank, Mortgage or Other Private Loan	5	9	—	—	1	—	1	—	3
State Loan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other*	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

*Other includes N.Y. state dorm. authority.

Table 13. Financing of Original Building ***Furniture*** *and* ***Equipment*** *at* ***Public*** *and* ***Private*** *Institutions, By Source of Funds—but Percent Derived From Each Source Not Given**
(26 Institutions Responding)

Source	Total Unions Using Source		Public	Private
	No.	%		
Union Fee Accumulations	10	38	9	1
City, County or State Appropriations	4	15	4	—
Large Gift	6	23	4	2
General Subscription	1	4	1	—
College Funds	5	19	1	4
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	—	—	—	—
HUD or HHFA	2	8	1	1
Revenue Bonds	5	19	5	—
Bank, Mortgage or Other Private Loan	1	4	1	—
State Loan	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	1	4	1	—
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	1	4	1	—
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—
Other	—	—	—	—

*This chart is based only on those unions that did not fill out percentages, it at least gives the reader an indication of the source used.

Table 14. Use of Consultants on All Construction, by Original Building, Additions, and Replacement Building
(189 Institutions Responding; 68% of Total Response)

Consultant	Total Unions		Original Building	1st Addition	2nd Addition	3rd Addition	Replacement Building
	No.	%	147	54	17	6	16
Building	119	63	115	36	10	3	9
Bookstore	89	77	77	28	11	2	8
Interiors	132	70	120	43	14	4	10
Other:							
Food Service	62	33	56	21	2	2	6
Theatre, Sound, Lighting	8	4	5	—	1	—	2
Bowling	2	1	2	—	—	—	—
Swimming Pool	1	—	1	—	—	—	—

Table 15. Expansion Plans, By Gross Area Estimate, By Enrollment
(92 Institutions Responding; 33% of Total Response)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Square Feet	No.	%				
Under 25,000	18	20	5	7	3	3
25,000-49,999	28	30	6	9	6	7
50,000-74,999	8	9	—	3	4	1
75,000-99,999	8	9	—	1	4	3
100,000-124,999	5	5	—	—	3	2
125,000-149,999	3	3	—	—	1	2
150,000-174,999	5	5	—	3	1	1
175,000-199,999	2	2	—	—	1	1
200,000-249,999	2	2	—	1	1	—
Unknown Size	14	15	4	1	3	6
TOTALS*	93		15	25	27	26

* 1 school listed 2 separate expansion plans (Over 10,000 enrollment)

Table 16. Expansion Plans, By Cost Estimate, By Enrollment
(92 Institutions Responding; 33% of Total Response)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Construction Cost	No.	%				
Under $250,000	4	4	2	1	—	1
$250,000-499,999	5	5	3	1	1	—
$500,000-749,999	4	4	1	1	1	1
$750,000-999,999	3	3	1	1	1	—
$1,000,000-1,249,999	6	7	2	4	—	—
$1,250,000-1,499,999	4	4	—	1	1	2
$1,500,000-1,749,999	6	7	1	2	1	2
$1,750,000-1,999,999	4	4	—	1	1	2
$2,000,000-2,499,999	7	8	1	—	1	5
$2,500,000-2,999,999	6	7	—	—	4	2
$3,000,000-3,499,999	3	5	1	—	2	5
$3,500,000-3,999,999	1	1	—	—	—	1
$4,000,000-4,499,999	6	7	—	1	1	4
$4,500,000-4,999,999	2	2	—	—	1	1
$5,000,000-5,999,999	6	7	—	2	4	—
$6,000,000-7,000,000	2	2	—	—	1	1
Over $7,000,000	3	3	—	2	—	1
Unknown Cost	19	20	3	8	7	1
TOTALS*	93		15	25	27	26

* 1 school listed 2 separate cost estimate plans (Over 10,000 enrollment)

Table 17. Expansion Plans, By Type and Enrollment (92 Institutions Responding; 33% of Total Response)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500–4999	5000–9999	Over 10,000
Type of Expansion	No.	%				
Addition	64	70	13	17	17	17
New Building	17	18	2	6	4	5
Branch or Satellite	11	12	—	2	5	4
Unknown*	1	1	—	—	1	—
TOTALS**	93		15	25	27	26

*Either addition or new building

**1 school lists 2 types of expansion, 1 addition and 1 satellite—Over 10,000 enrollment.

Table 18. Expansion By Estimated Date of Construction (92 Institutions Responding; 33% of Total Response)

Year	No. of Schools	% of Schools
1972	29	32
1973	18	19
1974	14	15
1975	11	12
1976	1	1
Unknown	20	21
TOTALS*	93	

*1 school lists 2 expansion plans and dates.

Table 19. *Chronological Development of Union Buildings*
(274 Institutions Responding)

Time Period	Institution**	Original Building	1st* Add.	2nd* Add.	3rd* Add.	Further* Add.	Replacement* Building
1896–1925	Univ. of Pennsylvania (Houston Hall)	1896	1939				
	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (NY)	1908					
	Ohio State Univ.	1911	1930	1940			1951
	Univ. of Rochester (NY)	1915					
	Univ. of Michigan	1919	1935	1938	1956		
	Univ. of Toronto (Hart House)	1919					
	Kansas State Teachers College	1922	1929	1955	1961	1972	
	Univ. of Georgia	1922	1955				
	Michigan State Univ.	1924	1935	1948			
	Purdue Univ. (Indiana)	1924	1929	1936	1939	1955,1958	
	Heidleberg College (Ohio)	1925	1971				
1926–1935	Emory Univ. (Georgia)	1926	1938	1949	1950	1971	
	Univ. of Iowa	1926	1955	1965			
	Florida Southern College	1927					
	Adelaide Univ. (Australia)	1928	1938	1958	1962		
	Iowa State Univ.	1928	1939	1948	1952	1958,1965	
	Oregon State Univ.	1928	1960				
	Univ. of Kansas	1928	1948	1953	1959	1970	
	Univ. of Oklahoma	1928	1949				
	Univ. of Wisconsin—Madison	1928	1939	1957	1966	1971*	
	Bowdoin College (Maine)	1929	1965				
	Keene State College (NH)	1929	1969				
	Duke Univ. (NC)	1930	1956				

*Branch or satellite building.
**The numeral 2 denotes a two-year college.

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Eastern Michigan Univ.	1931	1965				
	Indiana Univ.	1932	1959				
	Univ. of Texas	1933	1960				
	Marshall Univ. (WV)	1934	1963				1971
	Univ. of Florida	1935	1937	1954			1967
1936–1945	Southern Oregon College	1936					1971
	Univ. of North Carolina—Chapel Hill	1936					1969
	Univ. of Idaho	1936	1963				
	Washington & Lee Univ. (Virginia)	1936	1957	1969			
	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	1937	1969				
	West Carolina Univ. (NC)	1937					1968
	Univ. of Hawaii—Manda Campus	1938	1949				
	Spokane Falls Comm. College (Wash. 2)	1939	1967				
	Univ. of Akron (Ohio)	1939	1958	1967	1972		
	Univ. of Cincinnati (Ohio)	1939	1965				
	Univ. of Wyoming	1939	1959				
	Univ. of Minnesota	1940	1968	1971			
	Montana State Univ.	1940	1956	1967			
	Northwestern State Univ. (Louisiana)	1940					1966
1946–1950	St. Mary's College (Minn.)	1947					1969
	Northern Arizona Univ.	1948	1965	1970*			
	Midwestern Univ. (Texas)	1950	1963				
	Pacific Lutheran Univ. (Wash.)	1950	1956 (2nd. bldg)				1970

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	SUNY-Buffalo State College	1950	1968				
	Texas A & M Univ.	1950					
	Univ. of Texas-El Paso	1950	1957	1969			
	Univ. of Washington	1950	1959	1962	1966	1973	
1951-1957	Univ. of Arizona	1951	1957	1962	1971		
	Kansas State College—Pittsburg	1951	1963				
	Univ. of North Dakota	1951	1963				
	Ball State Univ. (Indiana)	1952	1959	1961			
	Centenary College of Louisiana	1952					
	Trinity Univ. (Texas)	1952	1953				
	Univ. of Connecticut	1952	1958				
	Univ. of Missouri—Columbia	1952	1961				
	Utah State Univ.	1952	1964				
	Washington State Univ.	1952	1968				
	Douglass College (New Jersey)	1953	1966				
	East Carolina Univ. (NC)	1953	1964				
	Ohio Univ.	1953					
	Univ. of Colorado	1953	1964				
	Univ. of Maine—Orono	1953	1961				
	Texas Tech Univ.	1953	1963				
	New York Univ.—Univ. Heights	1954	1964				
	North Carolina State Univ.—Raleigh	1954					
	Univ. of Maryland—College Park	1954	1963	1972			
	Univ. of Rhode Island	1954	1965				

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Univ. of Tennessee	1954	1967				
	Virginia State College	1954					
	Montclair State College (NJ)	1955					
	Pennsylvania State Univ.—Univ. Park	1955					
	Univ. of California—Davis	1955	1961	1966	1969		
	Valparaiso Univ. (Indiana)	1955					
	Adams State College (Colorado)	1956					1970
	Carroll College (Wisconsin)	1956					
	Illinois State Univ.—Normal	1956					1972
	Kansas State University	1956	1963	1970			
	Univ. of Minnesota—Duluth	1956					
	Univ. of New England (Australia)	1956	1961	1965	1969		
	Wake Forest Univ. (NC)	1956					
	Univ. of Wisconsin—Milwaukee	1956	1963	1971			
	Case-Western Reserve Univ. (Ohio)	1957 (building age is 1913, but opened as union 1957)					
	The Citadel (SC)	1957					
	Bradley Univ. (Illinois)	1957	1963				
	Eastern Illinois Univ.	1957	1967				
	Miami Univ. of Ohio	1957	1963				
	Univ. of Massachusetts—Amherst	1957	1970				
	Univ. of South Carolina	1957	1964				
	Univ. of Utah	1957	1970				
	West Liberty State College (WV)	1957	1969				
1958-	East Tennessee State Univ.	1958					

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd. Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
1962	Kearney State College (Nebraska)	1958	1961	1962	1964		
	Kwansei Gakuin Univ. (Japan)	1958					
	Marietta College (Ohio)	1958	1961				
	Milligan College (Tennessee)	1958					
	Pennsylvania State Univ.—Capital Campus (2)	1958					1967
	Portland State Univ. (Oregon)	1958	1961	1965			
	Rice Univ. (Texas)	1958					
	Southwestern Univ. (Texas)	1958					
	Stout State Univ. (Wisconsin)	1958	1964				
	Univ. of Virginia	1958	1963				
	Gettysburg College (Pennsylvania)	1959					
	Idaho State Univ.	1959	1966	1971			
	LaSalle College (Pennsylvania)	1959					
	New York Univ.—Washington Square	1959					
	Northern Michigan Univ.	1959	1964	1966			
	Oakland Univ. (Michigan)	1959	1962	1970			
	Southern Univ. (Louisiana)	1959					
	Tennessee State Univ.	1959	1969				
	Tulane Univ. (Louisiana)	1959					
	Univ. of Minnesota—St. Paul	1959					
	Univ. of Toledo (Ohio)	1959	1968	1972			
	Vincennes Univ. (Indiana 2)	1959	1967				
	Wichita State Univ. (Kansas)	1959	1969				

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Wisconsin State Univ.—La Crosse	1959	1964	1966*			
	Wisconsin State Univ.—Oshkosh	1959	1964				
	Wisconsin State Univ.—Superior	1959	1963	1969			
	Wisconsin State Univ.—Whitewater	1959	1964				
	Augustana College (Illinois)	1960					
	Carnegie-Mellon Univ. (Pennsylvania)	1960					
	Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania	1960	1963	1966	1970		
	Ithaca College (NY)	1960					
	Miami Dade Jr. College—North Campus (Florida 2)	1960	1962	1968	(building age is 1945, but opened as union 1960)		
	North Central College (Illinois)	1960					
	Oregon College of Education	1960	1972				
	St. Olaf College (Minnesota)	1960					
	Trinity College (Conn.)	1960					
	Central Missouri State College	1961	1967				
	Foothill College (Calif. 2)	1961					
	Illinois Institute of Technology	1961					
	Mohawk Valley Comm. College (NY 2)	1961	1971				
	Mt. Angel College (Oregon)	1961					
	Northeastern Illinois State College	1961					
	Northern State College (SD)	1961	1965	1970			
	North Idaho College (2)	1961	1962	1963			
	Southern Illinois Univ.—Carbondale	1961	1972				
	St. Norbert College (Wisconsin)	1961					

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institutions	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Univ. of California—Berkeley	1961	1965				
	Univ. of Missouri—Kansas City	1961					
	Victoria Univ. of Welington (New Zealand)	1961	1970				
	Weber State College (Utah)	1961	1969				
	Boston College (Massachusetts)	1962					
	CUNY-Brooklyn College	1962	1968				
	Drexel Univ. (Pennsylvania)	1962	1972				
	Hastings College (Nebraska)	1962					
	Moravian College (Pennsylvania)	1962					
	Stanford Univ. (California)	1962					
	South Dakota Schools of Mines & Tech.	1962	1971				
1963-1968	Boston University (Massachusetts)	1963					
	Canisuis College (NY)	1963					
	Concord College (WV)	1963					
	Hamline Univ. (Minnesota)	1963					
	Monmouth College (Illinois)	1963					
	Univ. of No. Carolina-Charlotte	1963	1966				
	Univ. of Redlands (California)	1963					
	Univ. of Tampa (Florida)	1963					
	Univ. of Victoria (British Columbia)	1963					
	Brigham Young Univ. (Utah)	1964					
	Elmhurst College (Illinois)	1964					
	Florida Presbyterian College	1964	1965	1967			

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Louisiana State Univ.—Baton Rouge	1964					
	Mississippi State Univ.	1964					
	Otterbein College (Ohio)	1964					
	Paris Jr. College (Texas 2)	1964					
	Rockland Comm. College (NY 2)	1964	1972				
	Western Illinois Univ.	1964	1969				
	Casper College (Wyoming 2)	1965					
	Fulton-Montgomery Comm. College (NY 2)	1965					1969
	Grossmont College (California 2)	1965	1971				
	Jefferson College (Missouri 2)	1965					
	Manchester College (Indiana)	1965					
	Mercy College of Detroit (Michigan)	1965					
	Marist College (NY)	1965					
	Shoreline Comm. College (Wash. 2)	1965	1972				
	St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)	1965					
	Univ. of Illinois—Chicago Circle	1965					
	Univ. of Miami (Florida)	1965					
	Univ. of South Dakota	1965					
	Winona State College (Minnesota)	1965	1969				
	Cornell College (Iowa)	1966					
	Cuyahoga Comm. College (Ohio 2)	1966 (building age is 1940, but opened as union 1966)					
	Flinders Univ. of So. Australia	1966	1968				
	Hamilton & Kirkland Colleges (NY)	1966					

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Lorain County Comm. College (Ohio 2)	1966					
	Newark College of Engineering (NJ)	1966					
	Northeastern Univ. (Massachusetts)	1966					
	Salem State College (Massachusetts)	1966					
	Southeastern Louisiana Univ.	1966					
	Southwestern at Memphis (Tennessee)	1966					
	Univ. of California—Santa Barbara	1966					
	Univ. of San Francisco (California)	1966					
	Univ. of Tennessee—Martin	1966					
	Virginia Military Institute	1966					
	Augsburg College (Minnesota)	1967					
	Boise State College (Idaho)	1967	1971				
	California State College—Los Angeles	1967					
	Capital Univ. (Ohio)	1967					
	Clarion State College (Pennsylvania)	1967					1971
	Duquesne Univ. (Pennsylvania)	1967					
	Parkland College (Illinois 2)	1967					
	Robert Morris College (Illinois 2)	1967					
	Southern Illinois Univ.—Edwardsville	1967	1969	1970			
	St. Louis Univ. (Missouri)	1967					
	SUNY—Albany	1967					
	Univ. of Hartford (Conn.)	1967					
	Univ. of Houston (Texas)	1967	1971				
	Univ. of Illinois Medical Center	1967					

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Univ. of Nevada—Las Vegas	1967					
	West Virginia Univ.	1967					
	Agri. & Tech. College at Alfred (NY 2)	1968					
	Bluffton College (Ohio)	1968					
	Concordia Teachers College (Nebraska)	1968					
	Dalhousie Univ. (Nova Scotia)	1968					
	Huntington College (Indiana)	1968					
	New Mexico State Univ.	1968					
	Penn. State Univ.—Behrend Campus	1968					
	Rhode Island College	1968					
	Simpson College (Iowa)	1968					
	SUNY—Canton (2)	1968					
1969-1973	Bellevue Comm. College (Wash. 2)	1969	1972				
	Berry College (Georgia)	1969					
	Bridgewater College (Virginia)	1969					
	Comm. College of Alleghany Co.—South Campus (Penn 2)	1969 (rented)					
	Hiram College (Ohio)	1969					
	Macquarie Univ. (Australia)	1969					
	Rutgers Univ.—New Brunswick (NJ)	1969					
	San Jose State College (California)	1969					
	SUC at Brockport (NY)	1969					
	Univ. of Northern Iowa	1969					
	William Rainey Harper College (Ill. 2)	1969					

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Wright State Univ. (Ohio)	1969	1971				
	Adelphi Univ. (NY)	1970					
	Albertus Magnus College (Conn.)	1970					
	Brandeis Univ. (Massachusetts)	1970					
	Bridgewater State College (Mass.)	1970					
	College of South Idaho (2)	1970					
	George Washington Univ. (Wash. D.C.)	1970					
	Georgia Institute of Technology	1970	1971				
	Highland Comm. College (Illinois 2)	1970					
	Kings College (Pennsylvania)	1970					
	Mt. Hood Comm. College (Oregon 2)	1970					
	Mountain View College (Texas 2)	1970					
	Rider College (NJ)	1970					
	SUC—Potsdam (NY)	1970					
	South Georgia College (2)	1970					
	SUNY at Fredonia	1970					
	Upsala College (NJ)	1970					
	Wagner College (NY)	1970					
	Willamette Univ. (Oregon)	1970					
	California State Polytechnic—San Luis Obispo	1971					
	College of Steubenville (Ohio)	1971					
	Green River Comm. College (Wash. 2)	1971					
	Madison College (Virginia)	1971					

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Mankato State College (Minnesota)	1971					
	Pennsylvania State Univ.—Beaver (2)	1971					
	Towson State College (Maryland)	1971					
	Univ. of Southwest Louisana	1971	1971				
	St. Edward's Univ. (Texas)	1971	(renovated dorm. into Union)				
	St. John's Univ. (NY)	1971					
	SUNY at Oneonta	1971					
	Univ. of Missouri—St. Louis	1971					
	Slippery Rock State College (Penn.)	1971					
	DePaul Univ. (Illinois)	1971					
	Jefferson State Jr. College (Ala. 2)	1972					
	Middlesex County College (NJ 2)	1972					
	Queens College of CUNY	1972					
	St. Mary's College (California)	1972					
	Southwest Minnesota State College	1972					
	Frostburg State College (Maryland)	1973					
	West Chester State College (Penn.)	1973					
	Linn-Benton Comm. College (Oregon 2)	1973					
Not used but responded—1972-1975 planned or under construction							
	Arizona Western College (2)	1972	under construction				
	Brookdale Comm. College (NJ 2)	1972	under construction				
	California State Polytechnic College—Pomona	1973					
	Somerset County College (NJ 2)	1974	planning				

Table 19. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	Calif. State College—San Bernardino	1975	planning				
	Sinclair Comm. College (Ohio 2)	under construction					
	Herbert H. Lehman College—CUNY	planning					
	Honolulu Comm. College (Hawaii 2)	planning					
	Sacramento State College (Calif.)	planning					
	Lake Superior State College (Michigan)	planning					
	Leeward Comm. College (Hawaii 2)	under construction					
	Livingston Univ. (Alabama)	planning					
	Macomb County Comm. College (Mich. 2)	planning					
	Virginia Commonwealth Univ.	planning					
	Concordia Teachers College (Illinois)	1972	under construction				
	North Hennepin State Jr. College (Minn. 2)	under construction					
	Bloomsburg State College (Penn)	1972	under construction				
	Triton College (Illinois 2)	under construction					
	Indiana State Univ.—Evansville	planning					
	California State College—Long Beach	planning					
	Wesley College (Delaware)	1973	under construction				
	Univ. of Guelph (Canada)	planning					
	Univ. of California—San Diego	planning					

Table 20. Gross Physical Plant Area of Union Buildings, In Square Feet
(262 Institutions Responding)

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enrollment	1970 Total Enrollment
Up to 30,000 Square Feet		
1. Florida Southern College	1,300	1,300
2. Taylor Univ. (Indiana)	1,400	1,400
3. Parkland College (Illinois 2)	3,296	3,296
4. Comm. College of Alleghany Co. (Penn. 2)	—	—
5. Milligan College (Tenn.)	800	800
6. Mt. Angel College (Oregon)	490	490
7. California Lutheran College	2,500	2,500
8. Robert Morris College (Illinois 2)	574	574
9. Univ. of Redlands (Calif.)	1,708	1,825
10. Highland Comm. College (Illinois 2)	1,000	1,000
11. North Idaho College (2)	974	974
12. Penn. State Univ.—Beaver Campus (2)	937	937
13. California State—Los Angeles	24,000	32,000
14. Univ. of Victoria (British Columbia)	4,936	5,221
15. College of Southern Idaho (2)	1,200	1,200
16. North Central College (Ill.)	838	838
17. Spokane Falls Comm. College (Wash. 2)	3,563	3,563
18. Bellevue Comm. College (Wash. 2)	2,821	2,821
19. St. Edward's Univ. (Texas)	1,100	1,160
20. Fulton-Montgomery Comm. College (NY 2)	1,369	1,369
21. Huntington College (Indiana)	550	550
22. Southwestern at Memphis (Tennessee)	1,040	1,040
23. Simpson College (Iowa)	960	960
24. Keene State College (N.H.)	2,000	2,000
25. Clarion State College (Penn.)	3,400	3,520
26. Marietta College (Ohio)	1,912	1,912
27. Paris Jr. College (Texas 2)	743	743
28. Northeastern Illinois State College	4,200	6,200
29. Vincennes Univ. (Indiana 2)	3,318	3,318
30. Heidelberg College (Ohio)	1,197	1,197
31. East Carolina Univ.—Greenville	8,978	9,272
32. Manchester College (Indiana)	1,470	1,470
33. St. John's Univ. [illegible]	7,713	8,263
34. College of Steubenville (Ohio)	1,058	1,058
35. Foothill College (Calif. 2)	5,459	5,459
36. Univ. of New England (Australia)	2,500	2,500
37. Trinity Univ. (Texas)	2,300	2,500
30,000–49,999 Square Feet		
1. Univ. of South Carolina	10,000	10,671
2. Hastings College (Nebraska)	813	813

*Rented building.
**The numeral 2 denotes a two-year college.

Table 20. Continued

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd. Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
1,500	1,500					
2,500	2,500 (space utilized on campus, not building)					
3,828*	3,828					
4,500*	4,500					
4,550	4,550					
5,000	5,000					
7,650	5,800	1,850				
9,879	9,879					
11,672	11,672					
13,000	13,000					
14,440	5,785	716	7,979			
14,955	14,955					
15,000	15,000					
15,304	15,304					
18,019	18,019					
19,000	19,000					
19,600	19,200	400				
19,940	16,940	3,000				
20,000	20,000					
20,073	unk.					20,073
21,000	21,000					
21,000	21,000					
23,276	23,276					
23,600	15,000	8,600				
24,000	14,000					24,000
24,735	20,055	4,680				
24,900	24,900					
25,000	25,000					
25,128	12,564	12,564				
25,850	8,000	16,600				
26,000	10,000	16,000				
27,000	27,000					
28,000	28,000					
28,500	28,500					
28,870	28,870					
29,292	11,500	6,666	8,232	2,900		
29,820	7,020					
30,000	17,000	13,000				
31,512	31,512					

Table 20. Continued

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enrollment	1970 Total Enrollment
3. Jefferson College (Missouri 2)	1,391	1,391
4. Augustana College (Illinois)	1,889	1,941
5. Southwest Minnesota State College	3,100	3,100
6. St. Francis College (Penn.)	1,600	1,644
7. Casper College (Wyoming 2)	2,200	2,200
8. Fairleigh Dickinson Univ. (N.J.)	2,500	2,500
9. Hiaram College (Ohio)	1,200	1,200
10. Bluffton College (Ohio)	666	666
11. Moravian College (Penn.)	1,270	1,270
12. St. Mary's College (Calif.)	1,165	1,165
13. SUNY—Canton (2)	1,800	1,800
14. Upsala College (N.J.)	1,350	1,350
15. Univ. of Hawaii—Manda Campus	14,727	17,298
16. Valparaiso Univ. (Indiana)	3,791	4,204
17. Kwansei Gakuin Univ. (Japan)	12,679	12,679
18. Winona State College	4,000	4,220
19. Rockland Comm. College (N.Y. 2)	—	—
20. Bradley Univ. (Illinois)	4,494	4,579
21. Monmouth College (Illinois)	1,250	1,250
22. Macquarie Univ. (Australia)	—	—
23. Southern Univ. (Louisiana)	7,252	8,452
24. Grossmont College (California 2)	5,000	5,000
25. Southwest Univ. (Texas)	800	800
26. Northern State College (S.D.)	3,000	3,000
27. Hamilton & Kirkland Colleges (N.Y.)	1,400	1,400
28. Green River Comm. College (Wash. 2)	2,379	2,379
29. Ithaca College (N.Y.)	3,881	3,881
30. West Liberty State College (W.V.)	4,000	4,000
31. Washington & Lee Univ. (Virginia)	1,300	1,500
32. Bowdoin College (Maine)	952	952
33. Rhode Island College	3,600	5,600
34. Salem State College (Mass.)	4,129	4,129
35. Univ. of Minnesota—St. Paul	3,385	4,000
36. Virginia Military Institute	1,130	1,130
37. Mohawk Valley Comm. College (N.Y. 2)	2,083	2,083
38. Indiana Univ. of Penn.	8,122	8,279
39. Carroll College (Wisc.)	1,259	1,259
50,000 to 74,999 Square Feet		
1. Adelaide Univ. (Australia)	8,000	8,700
2. St. Norbert College (Wisconsin)	1,651	1,651
3. Virginia State College	2,500	3,400
4. Kings College (Penn.)	2,500	2,500
5. Trinity College (Conn.)	1,400	1,550
6. Flinders Univ. of So. Australia	2,500	2,500
7. Midwestern Univ. (Texas)	3,905	3,905

Table 20. Continued

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd. Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
31,826	31,826					
32,000	32,000					
32,000	32,000					
32,080	32,080					
33,000	33,000					
33,674	33,674					
33,694	33,694					
33,900	33,900					
34,000	34,000					
34,000	34,000					
34,265	34,265					
34,340	34,340					
34,650	29,650	5,000				
34,753	34,753					
35,882	35,882					
36,000	18,000	18,000				
37,000	7,000	30,000				
37,750	23,950	13,800				
38,252	38,252					
38,400	38,400					
39,395	39,395					
39,433	28,633	10,800				
40,000	40,000					
40,000	18,000	8,000	14,000			
41,000	41,000					
42,150	42,150					
44,831	44,831					
45,000	9,000	36,000				
45,403	7,890	13,470	24,043			
45,710	18,500	27,210				
46,000	46,000					
46,080	46,080					
46,700	46,700					
47,053	47,053					
47,900	25,000	22,400				
48,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000		
48,757	48,757					
50,000	10,000	4,000	14,000	22,000		
50,000	50,000					
50,840	50,840					
52,000	52,000					
52,224	46,224	6,000				
52,400	37,000	15,400				
53,050	30,100	22,950				

Table 20. Continued

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enroll-ment	1970 Total Enroll-ment
8. Penn. State Univ.—Behrend Campus	1,250	1,302
9. West Carolina Univ. (N.C.)	5,178	5,265
10. Southeastern Louisiana Univ.	5,000	5,736
11. The Citadel	2,200	2,200
12. East Tenn. State Univ.	9,181	9,181
13. Rice Univ. (Texas)	2,297	3,110
14. Univ. of Missouri—Kansas City	6,406	7,891
15. Case Western Reserve Univ. (Ohio)	4,390	7,307
16. Univ. of Tennessee—Martin	4,411	4,572
17. Jefferson State College (Alabama)	4,084	4,084
18. Montclair State College (N.J.)	5,506	5,819
19. Univ. of Northern Iowa	8,302	8,552
20. Univ of South Dakota	4,152	6,277
21. Oregon College of Education	3,625	3,775
22. Hamline Univ. (Minnesota)	1,254	1,254
23. Univ. of Minnesota—Duluth	5,000	5,000
24. Albertus Magnus College (Conn.)	550	550
25. Guilford College (N.C.)	1,000	1,000
26. Univ. of North Carolina—Charlotte	4,000	4,300
27. Willamette Univ. (Oregon)	1,314	1,672
28. Stout State Univ. (Wisc.)	4,812	5,080
29. Capital Univ. (Ohio)	1,654	1,935
30. Frostburg State College (Maryland)	2,100	2,100
31. Wright State Univ. (Ohio)	5,311	5,494
32. Otterbein College (Ohio)	1,481	1,481
33. Augsburg College (Minn.)	1,500	1,500
34. SUNY Agri. & Tech. College at Alfred (2)	2,800	2,800
35. Univ. of Nevada—Las Vegas	3,703	5,415
36. Marist College (N.Y.)	1,500	1,500
37. Northwestern State Univ. of La.	5,000	6,000
38. Drexel Univ. (Penn.)	5,386	5,902
39. Slippery Rock State College (Penn.)	4,538	4,538
40. Victoria Univ. of Welungton—New Zealand	5,400	5,700
41. North Carolina State Univ.—Raleigh	11,007	13,325
42. Adelphi Univ. (N.Y.)	5,000	6,672
43. South Dakota School of Mines & Tech.	1,800	1,910
44. Canisuis College (N.Y.)	2,333	3,127
45. Madison College (Virginia)	4,000	4,531
46. Cornell College (Iowa)	960	960
47. Tennessee State Univ.	2,300	2,300
48. Wagner College (NY)	2,450	2,800
49. Wisconsin State Univ.—Whitewater	8,888	9,672
50. Middlesex County College (N.J. 2)	2,500	2,500
75,000 to 99,999 Square Feet		
1. Berry College (Georgia)	900	900

Table 20. *Continued*

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd. Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
55,000	55,000					
55,000	5,000					55,000
55,131	55,131					
55,148	55,148					
56,000	56,000					
56,398	56,398					
56,514	56,514					
56,755	56,755					
57,000	57,000					
57,500	57,500					
57,665	57,665					
58,000	58,000					
58,000	58,000					
58,066	45,694	12,372				
58,490	58,490					
58,969	56,385	2,584				
59,987	59,987					
60,000	unk.					60,000
60,000	30,000	30,000				
60,000	60,000					
60,300	30,010	30,290				
60,595	60,595					
61,000	61,000					
61,000	33,000	28,000				
61,839	61,839					
62,500	62,500					
64,000	64,000					
64,694	64,694					
65,000	65,000					
65,000	10,000					65,000
65,490	65,490					
67,000	67,000					
67,000	53,000	14,000				
67,768	67,768					
68,000	68,000					
68,000	40,000	28,000				
69,300	69,300					
70,574	70,574					
72,000	72,000					
72,526	72,526					
73,000	73,000					
73,466	36,943	36,523				
74,000	74,000					
75,000	75,000					

Table 20. Continued

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enroll-ment	1970 Total Enroll-ment
2. Gettysburg College (Pennsylvania)	1,800	1,800
3. LaSalle College (Pennsylvania)	3,500	7,200
4. Univ. of Rochester (N.Y.)	3,347	4,537
5. St. Mary's College (Minnesota)	951	951
6. SUC—Potsdam (NY)	3,600	3,660
7. West Chester State College (Penn.)	6,000	6,074
8. Kansas State College—Pittsburg	4,000	5,500
9. St. Olaf College	2,674	2,674
10. Angelo State Univ. (Texas)	3,205	3,205
11. Elmhurst College (Illinois)	1,700	1,700
12. DePaul Univ. (Illinois)	4,049	5,453
13. Univ. of Hartford (Conn.)	3,666	3,950
14. SUNY at Oneonta	4,487	5,270
15. Univ. of Pennsylvania—Houston Hall	6,990	13,690
16. Concord College (W.V.)	1,800	1,800
17. Univ. of Illinois—Medical Center	1,091	3,033
18. Univ. of Wyoming	7,150	8,455
19. Texas Tech. Univ.	17,095	19,167
20. Univ. of Rhode Island	7,268	9,244
21. Mt. Hood Comm. College (Oregon 2)	4,900	4,900
22. Pacific Lutheran Univ. (Wash.)	2,400	2,550
23. SUNY at Fredonia	4,900	4,900
24. Univ. of San Francisco (Calif.)	6,400	6,400
25. Ohio Univ.	16,000	17,063
26. New York Univ.—Washington Square	7,773	12,213
27. Mississippi State Univ.	7,115	7,738
28. Wisconsin State Univ.—Oshkosh	11,667	12,362
29. Adams State College (Colorado)	2,476	2,476
30. Rider College (NJ)	3,500	4,000
31. SUC at Brockport	4,423	4,423
100,000 to 124,999 Square Feet		
1. Carnegie-Mellon Univ. (Penn.)	3,000	4,000
2. Newark College of Engineering (NJ)	4,200	5,200
3. St. Louis Univ. (Missouri)	4,252	6,652
4. Stanford Univ.	6,000	11,000
5. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (NY)	3,735	4,748
6. New Mexico State Univ.—Las Cruces	6,173	6,696
7. Univ. of No. Carolina—Chapel Hill	11,142	16,233
8. Univ. of Maine—Orono	8,843	9,612
9. California State Polytechnic—San Luis Obispo	9,141	9,662
10. Miami Univ. of Ohio	11,000	11,619
11. Univ. of Missouri—St. Louis	8,491	9,680
12. Univ. of California—Santa Barbara	11,798	13,644
13. Univ. of Connecticut	11,100	14,675
14. Dalhousie Univ. (Nova Scotia)	4,574	5,545

Table 20. Continued

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
75,000	75,000					
75,000	75,000					
75,000	75,000					
76,000	76,000					
76,240	76,240					
78,000	78,000					
78,000	39,000	39,000				
80,000	80,000					
80,000	unk.					80,000
80,000	80,000					
80,562	80,562					
82,546	82,546					
82,613	82,613					
84,000	44,000	40,000				
85,000	85,000					
85,657	85,657					
87,000	63,000	24,000				
88,000	55,000	33,000				
89,792	28,792	61,000				
90,000	90,000					
90,000	10,000					90,000
90,200	90,200					
91,268	91,268					
91,388	91,388					
93,000	93,000					
93,640	93,640					
95,677	35,482	60,195				
96,000	18,400					96,000
99,000	99,000					
99,000	99,000					
100,000	100,000					
100,000	100,000					
100,000	100,000					
100,000	100,000					
100,052	unk.					100,052
100,200	100,200					
102,000	21,000					102,000
102,103	60,623	41,480				
103,000	103,000					
103,000	73,000	30,000				
103,365	103,365					
105,000	105,000					
105,000	50,000	55,000				
106,000	106,000					

Table 20. Continued

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enroll-ment	1970 Total Enroll-ment
15. Duke Univ. (N.C.)	4,378	7,015
16. Duquesne Univ. (Pennsylvania)	4,453	4,887
17. Wisconsin State Univ.—Superior	2,700	3,050
18. Mankato State College (Minnesota)	10,968	12,488
19. Rutgers Univ.—New Burnswick (NJ)	6,700	10,500
20. Eastern Illinois Univ.	7,887	8,825
21. Lorain County Comm. College (Ohio 2)	1,762	1,762
22. Boston College (Massachusetts)	6,750	8,837
23. Oakland Univ. (Michigan)	6,506	7,839
24. Kansas State Teachers College—Emporia	5,940	6,982
25. Northeastern Univ. (Mass.)	15,500	20,500
26. Illinois Institute of Technology	4,931	6,980
27. Marshall Univ. (WV)	6,000	6,600
28. Univ. of Toronto—Hart House	20,000	26,000
29. Wake Forest Univ. (N.C.)	2,520	3,210
125,000 to 149,999 Square Feet		
1. Texas A & M Univ.	14,000	—
2. Tulane Univ. (Louisiana)	3,950	6,497
3. Emory Univ. (Georgia)	2,400	5,000
4. SUNY—Albany	8,681	12,939
5. Central Missouri State College	9,484	10,467
6. William Rainey Harper College (Ill. 2)	2,578	2,578
7. Southern Oregon College	4,646	4,886
8. Boise State College (Idaho)	7,187	7,187
9. Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana	10,508	11,185
10. Brooklyn College—CUNY	19,428	19,734
11. Mercy College of Detroit (Michigan)	1,600	1,600
12. San Jose State College (Calif.)	17,540	23,865
13. Oregon State Univ.	14,702	17,413
14. Pennsylvania State Univ.—Univ. Park	21,000	25,000
15. SUNY Buffalo State College	6,725	9,241
16. Wisconsin State Univ.—La Crosse	6,356	6,467
17. Montana State Univ.—Bozeman	7,583	8,407
18. West Virginia Univ.	12,039	14,387
19. Univ. of Texas—El Paso	8,095	8,347
150,000 to 174,999 Square Feet		
1. Idaho State Univ.	6,291	6,865
2. Boston Univ. (Mass.)	13,335	17,474
3. Brandeis Univ. (Mass.)	2,300	3,200
4. Northern Michigan Univ.	8,000	8,000
5. University of North Dakota	8,129	9,413
6. Univ. of Texas—Austin	32,659	40,678
7. Utah State Univ.	7,207	8,532
8. Bridgewater State College (Mass.)	3,300	3,300

Table 20. Continued

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
106,338	90,026	16,312				
109,000	109,000					
109,400	30,000	22,400	57,000			
110,000	110,000					
110,000	110,000					
110,000	48,000	62,000				
112,000	112,000					
115,162	115,162					
115,898	68,008	47,810				
116,300	30,000	unk.	unk.	unk.	30,000	
117,000	117,000					
117,300	117,300					
120,000	unk.					120,000
120,000	120,000					
120,000	120,000					
125,000	125,000					
125,000	125,000					
126,000	23,675	29,531	unk.	unk.	25,000	
127,070	127,070					
130,000	60,000	70,000				
131,652	131,652					
133,548	49,540	84,000				
135,000	65,000	70,000				
135,191	108,599	26,592				
140,000	60,000	80,000				
144,000	144,000					
144,000	144,000					
145,000	85,000	60,000				
145,000	145,000					
145,910	34,890	111,020				
148,983	56,432	32,176	60,375 (sat.)			
149,000	37,000	47,500	64,500			
149,509	149,509					
149,779	21,090	41,642	87,047			
150,600	67,400	71,200	12,000			
155,513	155,513					
160,000	160,000					
160,000	60,000	50,000	50,000			
160,000	80,000	80,000				
160,000	80,000	80,000				
160,000	104,000	56,000				
161,000	161,000					

Table 20. Continued

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enroll-ment	1970 Total Enroll-ment
9. Portland State Univ. (Oregon)	9,500	12,000
10. Univ. of Missouri—Columbia	20,681	26,173
11. Univ. of Toledo (Ohio)	9,121	9,600
12. Univ. of Akron (Ohio)	9,677	14,432
13. Univ. of Oklahoma	18,000	23,000
14. Weber State College (Utah)	10,280	10,280
175,000 to 199,999 Square Feet		
1. Michigan State Univ.	32,176	40,511
2. Univ. of Utah	13,839	16,128
3. Univ. of Cincinnati (Ohio)	18,294	23,541
4. Towson State College (Maryland)	4,969	5,261
5. Univ. of Washington	15,154	23,202
6. Univ. of Virginia	10,852	15,128
7. Western Illinois Univ.	12,259	13,247
8. Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State Univ.	10,777	11,858
9. Wichita State Univ. (Kansas)	8,893	12,395
10. Ball State Univ. (Indiana)	17,000	20,300
11. Univ. of Houston	18,600	21,500
12. Univ. of Colorado	16,464	20,393
13. Univ. of Idaho	5,284	5,696
14. Georgia Institute of Technology	8,249	16,989
15. Univ. of California—Davis	8,294	8,294
16. Univ. of Miami	10,566	11,388
17. Northern Arizona Univ.	7,006	7,006
200,000 to 224,999 Square Feet		
1. Ohio State Univ.	35,746	46,074
2. Queens College of CUNY	10,000	25,847
3. Southern Illinois Univ.—Edwardsville	9,816	11,367
4. Iowa State Univ.	16,599	19,612
5. Washington State Univ.	12,000	13,600
225,000 to 249,999 Square Feet		
1. Univ. of Kansas	14,258	18,047
2. Univ. of Iowa	14,600	20,236
3. Univ. of Wisconsin—Milwaukee	12,185	13,000
4. Univ. of Maryland—College Park	26,711	34,164
5. Univ. of Florida	15,579	20,033
250,000 to 274,999 Square Feet		
1. Univ. of Arizona	22,000	27,000
2. Illinois State Univ.—Normal	14,512	17,549
3. Kansas State Univ.	11,490	13,528
4. Louisiana State Univ.—Baton Rouge	15,112	18,887
5. Univ. of California—Berkeley	17,634	26,766

Table 20. Continued

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
163,000	57,000	45,000				
164,019	54,000	49,937	59,082			
166,258	69,358	12,900	84,000			
170,000	24,000	40,000	60,000	36,000		
170,000	90,000	80,000				
173,000	67,000	106,000				
175,000	unk.	unk.	unk.			
175,000	150,000	25,000				
176,917	80,000	96,917				
178,000	178,000					
181,742	142,421	8,580	20,032	10,709		
183,000	150,000	33,000				
183,682	74,187	109,495				
184,366	54,366	130,000				
185,000	87,000	98,000				
190,000	55,000	20,000	115,000			
192,000	189,000	3,500				
193,500	146,702	46,798				
194,000	50,000	144,000				
195,000	115,000	80,000				
195,722	38,000	61,000	90,689	6,033		
197,319	197,319					
199,478	50,000	93,000	56,478 (sat.)			
203,200	5,000					203,200
204,000	204,000					
220,000	170,000	20,000	30,000		4-25,000	
221,000	108,000	15,000	11,000	40,000	5-22,000	
222,000	167,000	55,000				
225,000	100,000	10,000	80,000	20,000	15,000	
231,027	66,708	41,156	123,163			
231,680	18,000	100,000	113,680			
240,000	54,000	79,000	107,000			
249,080	36,000	5,600	28,000			249,080
250,000	100,000	10,000	40,000	100,000		
250,299	39,000					250,299
252,000	120,000	30,000	102,000			
265,000	265,000					
268,000	220,000	48,000				

Table 20. Continued

Institution**	1970 Undergrad. Enrollment	1970 Total Enrollment
275,000 to 299,000 Square Feet		
300,000 & Over Square Feet		
1. Brigham Young Univ.	22,641	25,021
2. Univ. of Michigan	23,440	31,170
3. Univ. of Tennessee—Knoxville	16,932	21,664
4. Univ. of Wisconsin—Madison	24,440	34,410
5. Univ. of Minnesota—Minneapolis	34,489	42,868
6. George Washington Univ. (Wash. D.C.)	4,323	6,873
7. Southern Illinois Univ.—Carbondale	19,720	20,778
8. Univ. of Illinois—Chicago Circle	17,000	19,000
9. Univ. of Massachusetts—Amherst	15,262	17,560
10. Purdue Univ. (Indiana)	20,234	25,582
11. Indiana Univ.	22,197	30,368

Table 20. Continued

Total Present Area*	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
304,000	304,000					
306,000	unk.					
310,000	105,000	205,000				
330,468	118,234	89,464	13,766	7,000	102,000 (sat.)	
334,406	321,118	6,228	7,060			
354,000	354,000					
354,142	104,124	250,018				
390,000	390,000					
400,000	105,000	295,000 (separate building-not sat.)				
467,871	unk.					
475,299	103,397	371,902				

Section 2

Organizational Structure

Table 21. Compositoon of Policy Making Body, Unions Established Before 1962 (121 Institutions Responding; 80% of Unions Established Before 1962)

Group Represented on Policy Board	No. of Representatives 1	2	3	4	5	6-8	9-10	Over 10	Open to All	Total Unions No.	%	Elected	Appointed	Ex-Officio	Some Elected, Some Appointed
Institution's Governing Board	16	3					1	2		22	18	4	10	5	2
President	16									16	13			13	
Vice-President	15		4							19	16		7	9	
Business Office	33	1								34	28	2	14	16	
Student Affairs Dean	41	16	3							60	50		34	25	
Faculty	16	33	20	5	8	5	2	1		90	74	9	74	6	1
Alumni	30	10	3					1		44	36	4	35	7	
Student Government	36	20	6	10	4	3	3	6		88	73	30	41	10	3
Union Board or Program	25	15	7	11	5	8	3	8		82	68	23	38	12	2
General Student Body	10	13	13	13	1	11	2	9	2	74	61	24	39	2	4
Union Staff	69	24	8	2	1	1				105	87		34	67	
Dean of College	1									1	1				
Other Administrative*	15	4	5							24	20		14	10	
Evening or Part-time Student	1									1	1		1		
Graduate Student	5	3								8	7	1	7		
Town	1									1	1		1		

*Includes such people as Dean of Admin., Dean of Student Life, Dean of Extension Center.
17 Unions had no policy board. 4 Unions—Director decides policy.

*Table 22. Composition of **Policy** Making Body, Unions Established 1963-1972*
(120 Institutions Responding; 95% of Unions Established 1963-1972)

Group Represented on Policy Board	No. of Representatives 1	2	3	4	5	6-8	9-10	Over 10	Open to All	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Elec-ted	Ap-pointed	Ex-Officio	Some Elected, Some Appointed
Institution's Governing Board	14	3	1		1		1	2		22	18	2	14	3	2
President	8									8	7		1	6	
Vice-President	8	1								9	8		5	2	
Business Office	34	2	1							37	31	2	15	18	
Student Affairs Dean	54	6	1							61	51		26	27	
Faculty	28	32	15	4	1	3				83	69	8	61	7	2
Alumni	33	3								36	30	1	26	4	
Student Government	37	22	9	5	4	11	1	9		98	82	38	39	10	3
Union Board or Program	32	9	8	6	3	10	2	6		76	63	17	42	11	1
General Student Body	13	16	9	11	2	10	5	9	1	76	63	36	29	3	3
Union Staff	74	18	8	2						102	85		31	58	
Dean of College															
Other Administrative*	11	5	3			1				20	17		11	5	1
Evening or Part-time Student		1								1	1		1		
Graduate Student	2	2								4	3		3	1	
Town	1									1	1		1		

*Includes such people as Dean of Admin., Dean of Student Life, Dean of Extension Center.

4 Unions had no policy board. 2 Unions—Director decides policy.

Table 23. ***Policy*** *Making Body Responsible to What Authority*
(188 Institutions Responding; 68% of Total)

Authority	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	51	27	18	19	33	36
Union Staff & Student Government	4	2	2	2	2	2
Student Government	18	10	10	10.4	8	9
President of College	37	20	20	21	17	18.4
Institutions Governing Board	17	9	10	10.4	7	8
Student Gov't & Institution's Governing Board	3	1.5	2	2	1	1
Student Affairs Dean	29	15	14	15	15	16.3
Student Gov't & Student Affairs Dean	3	1.5	3	3		
University Student Affairs Committee	5	3	2	2	3	3
Student-Faculty Committee	3	1.5	2	2	1	1
General Student Body	1	.5	1	1		
Union Board of Directors	2	1	2	2		
President & Institution's Governing Board	1	.5	1	1		
Vice-President or Dean of College	7	4	6	6	1	1
Independent	4	2	1	1	3	3
Union Corporation	1	.5	1	1		
Trustees	1	.5			1	1
Faculty Senate	1	.5	1	1		
TOTALS	188		96		92	

Table 24. Chairman of ***Policy*** *Making Body*
(232 Institutions Responding)

Chairman is Representative of:	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Program Board	74	32	40	33.3	34	30
Administration or Faculty	45	19	22	18.3	23	20
Student Government	36	16	16	13.2	20	18
Union Staff	19	8	10	8.3	9	8
Rotating System	10	4	4	3.3	6	5
Other**	49	21	28	23.3	21	19
TOTALS*	233		120		113	

*Policy Making Body had Co-chairman, both were listed—before 1962.

**Majority of these were students, or any member of the board (elected within group), also Pres. of Union, Pres. of Institution or Trustees.

Table 25. Frequency of Meetings of Policy-Making Body
(227 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Frequency	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Semi-Weekly	8	4	2	2	6	5
Weekly	57	25	33	27	24	23
Semi-Monthly	38	17	18	15	20	19
Monthly	80	35	39	32	41	39
Quarterly	12	5	10	8	2	2
Six times a year	5	2	2	2	3	3
Semi-Annually	4	2	1	1	3	3
Annually	3	1	3	2	—	—
No Regular Schedule	20	9	13	11	7	6
TOTALS	227		121		106	

Table 26. Composition of **Program** *Board, Unions Established Before 1962*
(112 Institutions Responding; 74% of Unions Established Before 1962)

Group Represented on Program Board	No. of Representatives 1	2	3	4	5	6–8	9–10	Over 10	Open to All	Total Unions No.	%	Elec-ted	App-ointed	Ex-Officio	Some Elected, Some Appointed
Student Affairs Dean	16	2								18	16		8	10	
Faculty	12	10	1			1				24	21	5	15	3	
Alumni	5									5	4	2	3		
Student Government	33	6			2	1		3		45	40	16	22	8	
General Student Body	4	2	4	3	5	12	2	28	1	61	54	17	40	2	
Student Chairmen of Program Committee	18	1	1	2	4	21	13	25		85	76	25	52	3	4
Union Staff	51	26	8	4		1				90	80		29	58	
Other Administrative	2	1	1		2					6	5	2	2	1	
Separate Activities Staff				1						1	1			1	
Policy Making Body			1							1	1		1		

17 had no program board.
16 same as policy board, listed on chart 21.

Table 27. Composition of **Program** *Board, Unions Established 1963–1972*
(89 Institutions Responding; 71% of Unions Established 1963–1972)

Group Represented on Program Board	No. of Representatives 1	2	3	4	5	6–8	9–10	Over 10	Open to All	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Elected	Appointed	Ex-Officio	Some Elected, Some Appointed
Student Affairs Dean	18	2								20	22	2	6	9	
Faculty	8	5	3	1	1	2				20	22	2	12	3	1
Alumni	1									1	1				
Student Government	17	5	3	1		1		3		30	34	15	10	4	
General Student Body	6	3	4	6	1	10	4	15	6	55	62	17	23	2	3
Student Chairman of Program Committee	21			1	6	20	5	11		64	72	24	29	5	3
Union Staff	58	12	3	1	1					75	84	3	17	47	
Other Administrative			1							1	1			1	
Separate Activities Staff		1								1	1			1	
Policy Making Body			1	1						2	2	1	1		

12 had no program board.
25 same as policy board, listed on chart 22.

*Table 28. **Program** Board Responsible to What Authority*
(220 Institutions Responding; 79% of Total)

Authority	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Before 1962 No.	Before 1962 %	1963-1972 No.	1963-1972 %
Union Staff	50	23	25	21	25	25
Policy Making Board	57	26	37	31	20	20
Student Government	51	23	21	18	30	30
Student Associations or General Student Body	8	4	7	6	1	1
Institution's Governing Body	4	2	4	3		
Student Affairs Dean	13	6	7	6	6	6
President	5	2	4	3	1	1
Campus Wide Committee (faculty & students)	2	1	1	1	1	1
Campus Student Affairs Council on Student Life	4	2	1	1	3	3
Policy Making Board & Personnel Dean	1	—			1	1
Union Staff & Student Body	4	2	2	2	2	2
Union Staff & Policy Making Board	7	3	4	3	3	3
Union Staff & Student Government	6	3	3	2	3	3
Union Staff & President	1	—			1	1
Policy Making Board & Student Government	4	2	1	1	3	3
Independent	3	1	3	2		
TOTALS	220		120		100	

*Table 29. Chairman of **Program** Board*
(229 Institutions Responding)

Chairman is Representative of:	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Before 1962 No.	Before 1962 %	1963-1972 No.	1963-1972 %
Union Policy Board	111	49	54	44	57	53
Student Government	33	14	12	10	21	20
General Student Body	34	15	23	19	11	10
Union Staff	12	5	7	6	5	5
Rotating System	6	3	3	2	3	3
Other*	33	14	23	19	10	9
TOTALS	229		122		107	

*Includes any member (elected from within group), Program Directors, faculty, or Union President.

Table 30. Frequency of Meetings of ***Program*** *Board*
(225 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Frequency	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Semi-Weekly	16	7	8	6.5	8	8
Weekly	151	67	85	70	66	64
Semi-Monthly	32	14	12	10	20	19
Monthly	14	6	8	6.5	6	6
Quarterly	—	—				
Six times a year	—	—				
Semi-Annually	1	1	1	1		
Annually	—	—				
No Regular Schedule	11	5	8	6.5	3	3
TOTALS	225		122		103	

Table 31. Method of Selection of ***Program*** *Board* ***Non-****student Members*
(152 Institutions Responding; 55% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Method of Selection	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Appointed by President	8	5	3	4	5	6
Appointed by Union Staff	12	8	8	10	4	5.5
Selected by Union Policy Making Body	6	4	5	6	1	1
Selected by Previous Program Board	4	3	2	3	2	3
Appointed by Faculty or Faculty/Student Committee	9	6	5	6	4	5.5
Appointed by Personnel Dean	4	3	2	3	2	3
Selected by Student Members of Program Board	1	—	1	1	—	—
Appointed by Faculty President or Respective Dean	4	3	2	3	2	3
Ex-Officio (Union Staff by virtue of position)	79	52	40	50	39	54
By Interview	1	—	1	1	—	—
Volunteer	2	1	—	—	2	3
By Students	4	3	2	3	2	3
By Appointment	18	12	9	11	9	13
TOTALS	152		80		72	

*Table 32. Method of Selection of **Program Board Student** Members*
(220 Institutions Responding; 79% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Method of Selection	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Appointed or Elected by Previous Program Board	34	16	23	19	11	11
Appointed or Elected by Program Board	24	11	15	13	9	9
Appointed or Elected by Student Government	16	7	8	7	8	8
Appointed by Union Policy Making Body	22	10	13	11	9	9
Elected in General Student Election	42	19	21	18	21	21
Appointed by President	1	—	—	—	1	1
Appointed or Elected by Coordinated Student Government-Program Board Effort	9	4	3	2	6	6
Appointed by Union Staff	1	—	1	1	—	—
Appointed by Faculty or Faculty/Student Committee	6	3	2	1	4	4
Elected by Committee System	8	4	6	5	2	2
Appointed by Personnel Dean	2	1	—	—	2	2
By Interview	9	4	9	8	—	—
By Appointment	16	7	3	2	13	13
Volunteer	30	14	15	13	15	15
TOTALS	220		119		101	

*Table 33. Compensation for **Program** Board Members*
(233 Institutions Responding; 84% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Compensation	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	59	25	40	32	19	18
No	174	75	86	68	88	82
TOTALS	233		126		107	

*Table 34. Compensated **Program** Board Members*
(72 Institutions Responding; 26% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Members	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
President	37	51	25	49	11	58
Vice-President	5	7	5	9		
Secretary	2	3	2	4		
Treasurer	3	4	3	6		
Board Officers	4	6	4	8		
Program Chairmen	10	14	8	15	2	10.5
All Student Members	5	7	3	6	2	10.5
Unknown	6	8	2	3	4	21
TOTALS	72		53		19	

*Table 35. Amount of Compensation for **Program** Board Members*
(59 Institutions Responding; 21% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Amount Compensated	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Up to $100 per year	4	7	3	7	1	5
$100-250 per year	8	14	6	13	2	11
$251-500 per year	17	29	12	28	4	21
$501-1000 per year	16	27	15	32	1	5
Over $1000 per year	3	5	1	2	2	11
3 hr. class credit	1	2	1	2	—	—
Tuition Remitted	7	12	3	7	4	21
Half Tuition Remitted	3	5	1	2	2	11
Unknown Amount	6	10	3	7	3	15
TOTALS*	65		46		19	

*6 Schools listed different amounts—pre-1962 group.

*Table 36. Awards for **Program** Board Members*
(217 Institutions Responding; 78% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Awards Given	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	100	46	61	53	39	39
No	117	54	55	47	62	61
TOTALS	217		116		101	

*Table 37. Nature of Awards for **Program** Board Members*
(100 Institutions Responding; 42% of Total)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Nature of Awards	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Key	7	6	6	8	1	2
Certificate/pin	39	33	21	29	18	39
Banquet	11	9	5	7	6	13
Small Memento	9	7	6	8	3	7
Trip	1	1	—	—	1	2
Life Membership	6	5	5	7	1	2
Plaque/Trophy	23	19	12	17	11	24
Blazer/Jacket	2	2	2	3	—	—
Pen-Pencil Set	2	2	1	1	1	2
Certificate & Plaque	2	2	2	3	—	—
Scholarship or Financial Aid	3	3	2	3	1	2
Engraved Watch for Outstanding Sr. Member	1	1	1	1	—	—
Unknown	12	10	9	13	3	7
TOTALS*	118		72		46	

*18 schools gave more than one type of award—11 pre-62 and 7 post-62.

Table 38. Number of Program Committees
(235 Institutions Responding)

Number of Committees	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%				
1-5	70	30	29	17	12	12
6	28	12	13	10	2	3
7	23	10	12	4	2	5
8	33	14	7	9	9	8
9	22	9	6	4	6	6
10	14	6	2	5	3	4
11	12	5	1	3	4	4
12	8	3	—	2	4	2
13	1	.4	—	—	1	—
14	1	.4	—	—	—	1
15	4	2	—	—	—	4
16-20	7	3	1	1	1	4
Over 20	9	4	—	1	3	5
Ad-Hoc Committee Approach	3	1	2	1		
TOTALS	235		73	57	47	58
No Program Committee	23	9	3	8	3	

Table 39. Size of Program Committees
(186 Institutions Responding)

Average No. of Students Per Committee	Unions	
	Number	Per Cent
1-10	137	74
11-15	26	14
16-25	19	10
26-35	3	2
Over 35	1	—
TOTALS	186	

Table 40. Method of Selection of Program Committee ***Chairmen***
(203 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Method of Selection	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Appointed or Elected by Policy Board	35	17	21	19	14	15
Elected or Appointed by Program Board or Officers	51	25	26	24	25	26
Election by Committee Members	38	19	23	21	15	16
Appointed by Committee Members	22	11	11	10	11	12
Appointed by Student Government	9	4	4	4	5	5
President of Union	3	2	1	1	2	2
Appointed by Outgoing Chairmen	19	9	8	7	11	12
Union Staff	9	4	4	4	5	5
Appointed by Union Staff and Outgoing Chairmen	3	2	2	2	1	1
Union Staff and Program Board	1	1	1	1	—	—
Interview	5	2	4	4	1	1
Volunteer	8	4	3	3	5	5
TOTALS	203		108		95	

Table 41. Types of Program Committees
(228 Institutions Responding)

			Date of Establishment of Committee			
	Total		Before 1967		Since 1968	
Committee	No.	%	No.		No.	
Visual Arts, Exhibitions	186	Comm.	164	Comm.	22	Comm.
Fine Arts-Cultural	124	54	112		12	
Arts & Crafts	15	7	11		4	
Exhibits	47	21	41		6	
Performing Arts	112	Comm.	89	Comm.	20	Comm.
Theatre	28	12	19		9	
Concerts, Music	84	37	70		14	
Social, Dance	243	Comm.	202	Comm.	41	Comm.
General-Social	120	53	113		7	
Dance	54	24	47		7	
Coffee House-Night Club	69	30	42		27	
Games-Tournaments	127	56	109		18	
Outings	38	Comm.	30	Comm.	8	Comm.
Sports	5	2	4		1	
Ski, sailing, camping, etc.	15	7	13		2	
Travel (Charter trips, etc.)	18	8	13		5	
Special Events	148	Comm.	113	Comm.	34	Comm.
Events (homecoming, parents)	147	64	113		33	
Orientation	1	—	—		1	
Lecture, Forum, Debate	144	Comm.	122	Comm.	22	Comm.
Forum-Lecture	129	57	110		19	
Literary	4	2	4		—	
Debate	3	1	2		1	
Political Union	2	1	2		—	
Quiz Bowl	3	1	1		2	
Model U.N.	3	1	1		2	
Publicity, Public Relations	165	Comm.	139	Comm.	26	Comm.
Publicity	91	40	77		14	
Union Newsletter	2	1	1		1	
Promotions	4	2	4		—	
Master Calendar	4	2	4		—	
Public Relations	51	22	41		10	
Publications	12	5	11		1	
Film	136	Comm.	113	Comm.	22	Comm.
Film Presentation	133	58	112		21	
Film Making	3	1	1		2	

Table 41. Continued

Committee	Total		Date of Establishment of Committee			
			Before 1967		Since 1968	
	No.	%	No.		No.	
Hobbies	7	Comm.	5	Comm.	2	Comm.
Camera Club	2	7	2		—	
Radio	5	2	3		2	
Community Volunteer Services	20	Comm.	10	Comm.	10	Comm.
Volunteer Services	19	8	9		10	
Blood Drive	1	—	1		—	
Services	82	Comm.	69	Comm.	13	Comm.
House-Hospitality	56	25	48		8	
Decorations	4	2	3		1	
Secretarial	2	1	2		—	
Arrangements	1	—	1		—	
Student Services	8	4	7		1	
Tickets	2	1	1		1	
Transportation	1	—	1		—	
Leadership Training	8	Comm.	6	Comm.	2	Comm.
Personnel	18	Comm.	15	Comm.	3	Comm.
Program Development	20	Comm.	14	Comm.	6	Comm.
Experimental Programs	3	1	1		2	
Programs & Project Development	7	3	4		3	
Research & Resources	10	4	9		1	
Building Operations	29	Comm.	21	Comm.	8	Comm.
Bookstore	1	—	—		1	
Finance	10	4	8		2	
Food	9	4	6		3	
Facilities	2	1	2		—	
Rules-Policy	7	3	5		2	
Special Interest Groups	17	Comm.	18	Comm.	9	Comm.
Afro-American	9	4	4		5	
Married Students	4	2	3		1	
Graduate Students	3	1	3		—	
Ethnic Affairs	2	1	—		2	
International	9	4	8		1	
Other	18	Comm.	11	Comm.	7	Comm.
Organics	1	—	—		1	
Ecology	2	1	1		1	
Short Course	1	—	1		—	
Spirit Pep Club	4	2	3		1	
Campus Organizations	4	2	1		3	
Academic	2	1	2		—	
Omnibus	1	—	—		1	
Summer	3	1	3		—	

Table 42. Frequency of Program Committee Meetings (Total Group)
(219 Institutions Responding)

Frequency of Meetings	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Semi-Weekly	22	10	9	8	13	13
Weekly	91	42	55	47	36	35
Semi-Monthly	20	9	5	4	15	15
Monthly	27	13	13	11	14	14
Quarterly	14	6	7	6	7	7
Semi-Annually	14	6	11	9	3	3
Annually	3	1	2	2	1	—
No Regular Schedule	18	8	10	9	8	8
Don't Meet All Together	10	5	5	4	5	5
TOTALS	219		117		102	

Table 43. Frequency of Program Committee Meetings (Individual Committee)
(208 Institutions Responding)

Frequency of Meetings	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Semi-Weekly	19	9	14	12	5	5.5
Weekly	99	47	51	44	48	52
Semi-Monthly	12	6	7	6	5	5.5
Monthly	10	5	8	7	2	2
Varies for Each Committee	20	10	12	10	8	9
No Regular Schedule (as needed)	48	23	24	21	24	26
TOTALS	208		116		92	

Table 44. Compensation for Program Committee Chairmen
(223 Institutions Responding)

Compensation for Chairmen	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	13	6	7	6	6	6
No	210	94	113	94	97	94
TOTALS	223		120		103	

Table 45. *Awards for Program Committee Members (218 Institutions Responding)*

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Awards Given	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	92	42	56	47	36	37
No	126	58	64	53	62	63
TOTALS	218		120		98	

Table 46. *Nature of Awards for Program Committee Members (92 Institutions Responding)*

	Total Unions		Date of Establishment			
			Before 1962		1963-1972	
Nature of Award	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Certificate	45	49	31	34	14	15
Banquet/Party	11	12	1	—	10	11
Key	6	7	5	5	1	1
Small Memento	4	4	2	2	2	2
Pin	4	4	2	2	2	2
Plaque	19	21	10	11	9	10
Service Award	1	1	1	1	—	—
Blazer/Jacket	1	1	1	1	—	—
Loving Cup	1	1	1	1	—	—
Desk Set	1	1	—	—	1	1
Scholarship	3	3	3	3	—	—
Membership Card	3	3	2	2	1	1
Trophy	3	3	2	2	1	1
Unknown	12	13	9	10	3	3
TOTALS*	114		70		44	

*If more than one award, both were listed.

Section 3

Professional Staff

Table 47. Number of Professional Staff Members Employed
(278 Institutions Responding)

No. Staff	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Positions	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	72	26	46	55	18	27	6	10	2	3
Two	47	17	22	26	16	24	7	12	2	3
Three	40	14	9	10	12	18	13	22	6	9
Four	21	8	3	3	5	8	8	13	5	8
Five	25	9	3	3	7	11	6	10	9	13
Six or more	73	26	3	3	8	12	20	33	42	64
TOTALS	278		86		66		60		66	

Table 48. Faculty Rank of Staff Members
(99 Institutions Responding; 36% of Total)

	Faculty Rank	
Position	No.	
Director or Manager	96	(34.5% of 278 Directors)
Administrative Assistant	7	
Assistant Director	33	
Program Director	29	
Food Service Manager	5	
Bookstore Manager	1	
TOTALS	171	

Table 49. Educational Background of Union Director
(274 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions			Enrollment											
				Under 2500 (86 unions)			2500–4999 (66 unions)			5000–9999 (60 unions)			Over 10,000 (66 unions)		
	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.
Administration (school)	1	10	3	—	4	1	—	1	1	1	3	1	—	2	—
Business	31	10	—	4	1	—	7	2	—	7	2	—	13	5	—
Education	3	18	5	2	5	—	1	7	—	—	4	1	—	2	4
Economics	2	2	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—
Engineering	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
English	2	6	—	1	1	—	—	3	—	—	2	—	1	—	—
Fine Arts-Music, Drama	7	2	—	4	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	—
Guidance & Counseling	—	37	1	—	14	—	—	11	1	—	5	—	—	7	—
History-Political Science	13	8	—	5	3	—	2	—	—	1	1	—	5	4	—
Math	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—
Home Economics	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Social Administration-Sociology	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	—	—
Hotel-Restaurant	6	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	4	—	—
Language	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Law	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Student Personnel	—	39	3	—	13	1	—	14	1	—	8	—	—	4	1
Theology	3	2	—	3	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Philosophy	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Physical Education	3	9	—	1	2	—	—	2	—	1	3	—	1	2	—
Natural & Physical Science	3	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	—	—

Table 49. Continued

	Total Unions			Enrollment											
				Under 2500 (86 unions)			2500–4999 (66 unions)			5000–9999 (60 unions)			Over 10,000 (66 unions)		
	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.
Psychology	1	10	1	—	4	—	1	1	—	—	4	1	—	1	—
College Union Admin.	1	4	—	—	2	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Recreation	2	4	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1	1	—
Speech	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	85	171	15	23	56	3	16	48	4	17	37	3	29	30	5

Three directors had no degrees—2 Under 2500; 1 5000–9999.

Table 50. Educational Background of Subordinate Staff Members
(191 Institutions Responding)

Major Field	Total		Staff Positions						
	No.	%	Assistant Director	Admin. Assistant	Program Director	Food Manager	Bookstore Manager	Night Manager	Business Manager
Administration	9	2	7	—	2	—	—	—	—
Forestry	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Business	89	19	26	9	8	7	11	6	22
Economics	4	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Education	44	10	19	5	15	1	1	3	—
Engineering	3	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	—
English	19	4	9	1	7	—	1	1	—
Drama & Fine Arts	16	4	6	2	6	1	—	1	—
Guidance & Counseling	41	9	20	1	18	—	—	1	1
History & Political Science	19	4	6	—	7	2	1	3	—
Home Economics	15	3	1	—	2	12	—	—	—
Hotel-Restaurant	17	4	1	—	—	16	—	—	—
Journalism	5	1	1	—	2	1	—	—	1
Languages	4	1	1	—	2	—	1	—	—
Optometry	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Law	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—
Philosophy	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Religion	1	—	1	—	—	—	—		
Student Personnel	34	7	15	1	16	—	—	1	1
Physical Education	9	2	4	1	3	—	—	1	—
Physical & Natural Science	9	2	4	1	—	1	1	2	—
Psychology	10	2	3	—	7	—	—	—	—

Table 50. Continued

Major Field	Total No.	Total %	Staff Positions: Assistant Director	Staff Positions: Admin. Assistant	Staff Positions: Program Director	Staff Positions: Food Manager	Staff Positions: Bookstore Manager	Staff Positions: Night Manager	Staff Positions: Business Manager
Recreation	25	5	7	4	13	—	—	1	—
Sociology-Social Science	15	3	5	1	6	—	2	1	—
Architecture	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	
Liberal Arts	10	2	2	1	4	—	—	2	1
Speech	4	1	2	1	1	—	—	—	—
No Degree	62	13	13	12	—	17	10	7	3
TOTALS	470		161	43	119	58	28	32	29

Program Director position includes those listed as program advisor, etc., also there may be more than one program director at one school.
Those such as Recreation Managers, and/or theatre managers were not used since it was difficult to classify in only one of above Staff Positions.

Table 51. *Union Functions of Director*
(268 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
	Total		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Union Function	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Student Programs and Activities	244	91	79	94	60	94	51	91	58	91
Food Service	129	48	34	40	23	36	33	59	40	63
Operation of Recreation Facilities	230	86	74	88	56	88	48	86	56	88
Bookstore Operation	74	28	24	29	10	16	17	30	24	38
Guest Room Operation	53	20	16	19	5	8	12	21	20	31
Building Maintenance	201	75	60	71	41	64	45	80	59	91
General Building Services	233	87	72	86	53	83	51	91	60	94
Physical Plant Department	92	34	16	19	17	27	24	43	35	55

Based on-84 Unions—Under 2500; 64 Unions—2500-4999; 56 Unions—5000-9999; 64 Unions—Over 10,000

Table 52. *Functions of Assistant Director*
(139 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment			
	Total		Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Union Function	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Student Programs and Activities	88	63	20	26	19	23
Food Service	30	22	5	6	11	8
Operation of Recreation Facilities	85	61	20	19	18	28
Bookstore Operation	10	7	2	1	2	5
Guest Room Operation	16	12	2	—	5	9
Building Maintenance	79	57	11	17	17	34
General Building Services	101	73	16	19	22	44
Physical Plant Department	43	31	5	7	10	21

Table 53. Union Function of Administrative Assistant
(49 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment			
	Total		Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Union Function	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Student Programs and Activities	14	29	1	4	5	4
Food Service	4	14	—	1	2	4
Operation of Recreation Facilities	22	45	1	5	5	11
Bookstore Operation	4	8	—	—	1	3
Guest Room Operation	9	18	2	—	2	5
Building Maintenance	34	69	2	5	12	15
General Building Services	40	82	3	7	13	17
Physical Plant Department	22	45	1	3	6	12

Table 54. Union Function of Program Director
(109 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment			
	Total		Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Union Function	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Student Programs and Activities	109	100	7	26	30	46
Food Service	2	2	1	—	1	—
Operation of Recreation Facilities	26	24	2	2	8	14
Bookstore Operation	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guest Room Operation	—	—	—	—	—	—
Building Maintenance	—	—	—	—	—	—
General Building Services	12	11	2	2	7	1
Physical Plant Department	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table 55. Union Function of Food Manager
(69 Institutions Responding)

	Total		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Union Function	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Student Programs and Activities	1	1	1	—	—	—
Food Service	69	100	9	11	17	32
Operation of Recreation Facilities	1	1	1	—	—	—
Bookstore Operation	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guest Room Operation	1	1	—	—	1	—
Building Maintenance	—	—	—	—	—	—
General Building Services	1	1	—	—	—	1
Physical Plant Department	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table 56. Union Function of Night Manager
(26 Institutions Responding)

	Total		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Union Function	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Student Programs and Activities	11	42	2	1	4	4
Food Service	4	15	—	1	2	1
Operation of Recreation Facilities	16	62	7	2	3	4
Bookstore Operation	1	4	—	—	1	—
Guest Room Operation	3	12	1	—	1	1
Building Maintenance	16	62	3	3	2	8
General Building Services	19	73	3	4	2	10
Physical Plant Department	4	15	—	1	2	1

*Table 57. Line of Responsibility of Staff Members of Union Established **Before** 1962*
(128 Institutions Responding)

To Whom Staff Person is Responsible	Staff Position							
	Director		Assistant Director	Adm. Assistant	Program Director	Food Manager	Bookstore Manager	Night Manager
	No.	%						
President	11	9						
Vice President for Administration	4	3						
Student Affairs Dean	68	53	1		4	1		
Business Manager	7	5	1			5	1	
Student Government	1	1						
Union Director	—		97	22	57	33	14	8
Assistant Director	—			3	12	2	1	4
Union Policy Board	6	5					1	
Institution's Governing Board	—							
Dining Service Manager	1	1				1		
Student Activities Director	1	1			1			
Director of Student Facilities	1	1						
Director of Auxiliary Enterprises	4	3						
Associate Dean of Student Affairs	7	5			1			
Student Affairs Dean & Vice President for Administration	2	1.5						
Student Affairs Dean & Business Manager	6	5						
President & Union Policy Board	2	1.5						
Student Affairs Dean & Union Policy Board	2	1.5						
Director of Auxiliary Enterprises & Student Affairs Dean	1	1						

Table 57. Continued

To Whom Staff Person is Responsible	Staff Position							
	Director		Assistant Director	Adm. Assistant	Program Director	Food Manager	Bookstore Manager	Night Manager
	No.	%						
Union Director & Student Affairs Dean	—		1					
President & Student Government	—							
Union Director & Business Mgr.	—					1	3	
Student Affairs Dean & President	2	1.5						
Student Affairs Dean & Director of Physical Plant	2	1.5	1					
TOTALS	128		101	25	75	43	20	12

Table 58. *Line of Responsibility of Staff Members of Unions Established 1963–1973*
(130 Institutions Responding)

To Whom Staff Person is Responsible	Staff Position							
	Director		Assistant Director	Adm. Assistant	Program Director	Food Manager	Bookstore Manager	Night Manager
	No.	%						
President	7	5						
Vice President for Administration	1	1						
Student Affairs Dean	88	68			3	2		
Business Manager	9	7		1		2	7	
Student Government	1	1						
Union Director	—		62	12	41	12	8	7
Assistant Director	—			5	4	3	2	7
Union Policy Board	3	2						
Institutions Governing Board	1	1						
Dining Service Manager	—					2		
Student Activities Director	—							
Director of Student Facilities	—							
Director of Auxiliary Enterprises	3	2						
Associate Dean of Student Affairs	2	1			1			
Student Affairs Dean & Vice President for Administration	6	5						
Student Affairs Dean & Business Manager	7	5						
President & Union Policy Board	—							
Student Affairs Dean & Union Policy Board	1	1						

Table 58. Continued

To Whom Staff Person is Responsible	Staff Position							
	Director		Assistant Director	Adm. Assistant	Program Director	Food Manager	Bookstore Manager	Night Manager
	No.	%						
Director of Auxiliary Enterprises & Student Affairs Dean	—							
Union Director & Student Affairs Dean	—		2					
President & Student Government	1	1						
Union Director & Business Mgr.	—					2	1	
Student Affairs Dean & President	—							
Student Affairs Dean & Director of Physical Plant	—							
TOTALS	130		64	18	49	23	18	14

*Table 59. **Non-Union Functions of Union Director** (162 Institutions Responding; 58% of Total)*

Non-Union Function or Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Under 2500	2500–4999	5000–9999	Over 10,000
Student Activities Coordination	46	28	17	13	12	4
Organization Advisor	27	17	5	6	7	9
Adult Conference Program	6	4	3	3		
General Student Personnel Work	21	13	8	5	6	2
Orientation Program	7	4	4	2	1	
Teaching	20	12	12	1	5	2
College Dining Service	5	3		3	1	1
Residence Halls-Housing	14	9	6	5	2	1
Concert Series	2	1	1		1	
All Auxiliary Enterprises	2	1	1		1	
Alumni Affairs	1	1				1
Campus Development	1	1				1
Bookstore	1	1	1			
Campus Committee Work	25	15	7	5	3	10
I.D. Cards	3	2	1	2		
Public Relations	1	1	1			
Commencement Program	5	3	2	1	1	1
Health Services	1	1		1		
Business Office Functions	5	3	1	2	2	
Coaching	3	2	1	2		
Director of Other Campus Facility	10	6	3	2	4	1
Convocation Series	9	6	7	1	1	
Student Guidance & Counseling	11	7	10	1		
Student Financial Aids	6	4	3	2		1
Academic Advisor	1	1	1			
Placement	9	6	6	3		
Special Events-Scheduling Master Calendar	23	14	7	7	6	3

Table 60. Years of Employment in Present Position
(262 Institutions Responding)

Staff Position	Total	Years 1–2 No.	1–2 %	3–5 No.	3–5 %	6–10 No.	6–10 %	11–15 No.	11–15 %	16–25 No.	16–25 %	Over 25 No.	Over 25 %
Director	261	92	35	94	36	37	14	23	9	13	5	2	1
Assistant Director	146	84	58	37	25	15	10	7	5	3	2	—	
Administrative Assistant	46	20	43	12	26	9	20	3	7	2	4	—	
Program Director	123	76	62	27	22	17	14	2	2	1	1	—	
Food Manager	63	27	43	11	17	9	14	6	10	10	16	—	
Bookstore Manager	33	8	24	12	37	2	6	7	21	3	9	1	3
Night Manager	21	18	85	2	10	1	5	—		—		—	

1 director filled out information for staff but not for self.

Table 61. Other Union Employment by Position
(269 Institutions Responding)

Director

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					109	41	No previous union experience
38	6	2			46	17	Union director position at another college
32	3	2			37	13	Subordinate union positions at present college
47	26	2	1	1	77	29	Subordinate union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					269		

Assistant Director

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					76	53	No previous union experience
26	6		1		33	23	Other union positions at present college
27	6	2			35	24	Union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					144		

Administrative Assistant

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					30	77	No previous union experience
6					6	15	Other union positions at present college
3					3	8	Union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					39		

Program Director

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					79	68	No previous union experience
13	2				15	13	Other union positions at present college
19	3				22	19	Union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					116		

Food Manager

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					27	52	No previous union experience
11					11	21	Other union positions at present college
12	2				14	27	Union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					52		

Table 61. Continued

Bookstore Manager

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					14	54	No previous union experience
7					7	27	Other union positions at present college
5					5	19	Union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					26		

*Table 62. Previous Non-Union Employment, By Position and Type of Employment**
(205 Institutions Responding)

Type of Employment	Director		Admin. Assistant		Assistant Director		Program Director		Food Manager		Bookstore Manager		Night Manager	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Educational	113	52	11	31	46	46	45	58	3	7	2	10	3	25
Coaching	11	5	2	6	6	6	2	3					1	8
Business	38	17	14	40	26	26	7	9	2	5	12	60	4	33
Government (State/Federal)	7	3	2	6	4	4	2	3			4	20	1	8
Hotel/Restaurant (includes food service in hospital, residence hall, etc.)	7	3			3	3			37	86				
Religion	7	3					1	1					1	8
Service Field (career)	7	3	2	6	2	2	1	1						
Service Field (non-career)	18	8	1	2	5	5	4	5	1	2	2	10	2	17
Entertainment	1	1					3	4						
Youth-Recreation	10	5	3	9	8	8	12	16						
TOTALS	219		35		100		77		43		20		12	

*If more than one type of occupation were given, all were listed separately.

Table 63.—Previous Non-Union Employment, by Number of Positions
(247 Institutions Responding)

No. of Non-Union Positions Held	Director		Admin. Assistant		Assistant Director		Program Director		Food Manager		Bookstore Manager		Night Manager	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	75	30	13	32	55	39	53	54	13	24	12	44	6	32
1	98	40	21	51	54	38	46	39	28	52	10	37	13	68
2	51	21	5	12	27	19	14	12	9	17	4	15	—	
3	15	6	1	2.4	4	3	4	4	3	6	1	4	—	
4	6	2	1	2.4	1	1	—		—		—		—	
5 or more	1	1	—		—		—		1	1	—		—	
TOTALS*	246		41		141		117		54		27		19	

*1 director filled out information for staff but not for self.

Section 4

Financial Operation
of the
Union

Table 64. Union Fees
(187 public institutions responding; 91 private)

Nature of Fee	Public		Private	
	No.	%	No.	%
Building Amortization & Operation Fees Combined	84	45	36	40
Building Amortization Only	30	16	9	9
Operation Only	17	9	8	9
Separate Building Amortization & Operation Fees	14	7	8	9
No Union Fee	35	19	27	30
Activity Program Fee Only	7	4	3	3
TOTALS	187		91	

Table 65. Assignment of Union Fees
(187 Public institutions responding; 91 private)

	Public		Private	
	No.	%	No.	%
Union fee shown separately and directly assigned to Union	40	21	17	20
Union fee is assessed within the structure of general student fees; not shown separately	97	52	42	46
Other	5	3	4	4
No Union Fee	35	19	27	30
Unknown	10	5	1	—
TOTALS	187		91	

Table 66. Union Fee—By Semester (undergraduate only)
(150 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
Fee Paid	Total		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Per Semester*	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0-1.99	6	4	2	5	2	6	1	3	1	3
2-4.99	4	3	—	—	1	3	1	3	2	5
5-9.99	29	19	5	12	8	23	8	23	8	22
10-14.99	38	25	13	30	3	9	8	23	14	38
15-19.99	24	16	5	12	6	17	7	19	6	16
20-24.99	15	10	4	9	4	11	3	9	4	11
25-29.99	19	13	9	21	4	11	4	11	2	5
30-34.99	3	2	1	2	1	3	1	3	—	—
35-39.99	7	4	2	5	5	14	—	—	—	—
40-44.99	1	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over $45	4	3	1	2	1	3	2	6	—	—
TOTALS	150		43		35		35		37	

*Includes the four types of union fees listed in Table #64.

Table 67. Union Fee—By Quarter (undergraduate only)
(50 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
Fee Paid	Total		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Per Quarter*	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0-1.99	4	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	21
2-4.99	5	10	2	20	1	11	—	—	2	11
5-9.99	19	38	2	20	1	11	7	58	9	47
10-14.99	14	28	1	10	6	67	4	34	3	16
15-19.99	1	2	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—
20-24.99	1	2	—	—	1	11	—	—	—	—
25-29.99	3	6	2	20	—	—	—	—	1	5
30-34.99	1	2	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—
35-39.99	1	2	—	—	—	—	1	8	—	—
40-44.99	1	2	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over $45	—									
TOTALS	50		10		9		12		19	

*Includes the four types of union fees listed in Table #64.

Table 68. *Union Fee—Increase Since 1962**
(71 Institutions Responding; 47% of 152 Unions Established Before 1962)

Person Assessed	Percent of Increase**										Amount of Increase				
	0–25%		26–50%		51–75%		76–100%		Over 100%		$0–4.99	$5–9.99	$10–19.99	$20–29.99	Over $30
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%					
Undergraduate	15	10	19	13	7	5	13	9	13	9	21	26	16	4	4
Graduate Student	9	6	9	6	4	3	9	6	5	3	15	17	4	3	2
Faculty member	1	1	1	1	1	1	—		—		1	1	1	—	—
Alumni Member	—		2	1	—		—		—		—	1	1	—	—
Life Member	1	1	—		—		—		—		—	—	1	—	—

*Does not include union fees on buildings established since 1962—as this would be a new fee not an increase.

**Often conditioned by additional debt due to new construction.

*Table 69. Anticipated Increase in Union Fee, Per Year**
(32 Institutions Responding; 12% of Total)

Person Assessed	Amount of Increase							
	$0- 1.99	$2- 3.99	$4- 4.99	$6- 7.99	$8- 9.99	$10- 14.99	$15- 20	Over $20
Undergraduate	3	11	5	3	1	6	2	1
Graduate Student	2	6	4	1	1	2	2	2
Faculty member	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—
Alumni Member	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Life Member	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

*Includes the four types of Union Fees listed in Table #64.

Table 70. Union Fee for Undergraduates in Summer Session, By Type of Fee
(105 Institutions Responding; 38% of Total)

Amount Assessed	Type of Fee				
	Building Fee Only	Operating Fee Only	Combined Fee	Both Building & Operating	
$0-1.99	3	—	3	1	5
2-4.99	4	3	20	3	4
5-7.49	3	4	21	2	1
7.50-9.99	2	2	14	—	—
10-20	3	1	7	2	—
Over $20	—	—	2	—	—
TOTALS	15	10	67	8	10

Table 71. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Food Service (272 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Operated by:										
College Union Management	76	28	15	18	9	14	19	32	33	51
College Dining Service	77	28	25	30	26	41	14	23	12	18
College Union Management & College Dining Service	1	—	1	1						
Institutional Caterer	109	40	42	50	24	39	25	42	18	28
Other Arrangement	9	4	1	1	4	6	2	3	2	3
TOTALS	272		84		63		60		65	
Total Food Service Operations are:										
Entirely Self-Supporting	126	77	35	70	33	85	31	84	27	73
Subsidized as to Any Losses	37	23	15	30	6	15	6	16	10	27
TOTALS	163		50		39		37		37	
Expected to Contribute Profits to Total Operation	118	55	34	61	19	43	29	55	36	60
Expected to Divert Profits Elsewhere	28	13	9	16	9	20	4	8	6	10
Profits Split-Total Operation & Elsewhere	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2
Subject to Union Rental Charge for Space	53	25	10	18	3	30	16	30	14	23
Other	12	6	3	5	3	7	3	5	3	5
TOTALS	213		56		44		53		60	

Table 71. Continued

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Purchases are Handled by:										
College Union Management	47	17	9	12	6	10	13	22	19	30
College Union Management & Other	1	—	—		—		1	2	—	
College Union Management, College Dining Service & College Purchasing Dept.	2	1	—		1	2	1	2	—	
College Dining Service	55	21	22	27	15	23	10	16	8	12
College Dining Service & College Union Management	3	1	1	1	1	2	—		1	2
Institutional Caterer	99	37	35	43	24	37	22	37	18	28
Institutional Caterer & College Purchasing Dept.	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	—	
College Purchasing Department	31	12	5	6	9	14	7	12	10	15
College Purchasing Department & College Dining Service	6	2	1	1	4	6	—		1	2
College Purchasing Department & College Union Management	15	6	4	5	1	2	4	7	6	9
Other	5	2	3	4	1	2	—		1	2
TOTALS	267		81		63		59		64	

Enrollment Breakdown—Under 2500—86 Unions
2500-4999—66 Unions
5000-10,000—60 Unions
Over 10,000—66 Unions

Table 72. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Bookstore (243 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Operated by:										
College Union Management	59	24	21	28	9	14	12	23	17	34
Union & Business Office	3	1	2	3	—	—	1	2	—	—
College Business Office	124	52	37	49	40	63	25	47	22	44
Other Arrangements (co-op, private, auxiliary services)	57	23	16	20	15	23	15	28	11	22
TOTALS	243		76		64		53		50	
Bookstore Operations are:										
Entirely Self-supporting	133	89	39	81	38	93	26	93	30	94
Subsidized as to Any Losses	16	11	9	19	3	7	2	7	2	6
TOTALS	149		48		41		28		32	
Expected to Devote % of Profits to Union:										
0-25%	16		3		2		7		4	
26-50%	3		1		—		1		1	
51-75%	—		—		—		—		—	
76-100%	29		8		5		6		10	
Unknown percent	15		5		4		4		2	
SUB-TOTALS	63	33	17	34	11	27	18	38	17	33
Expected to Devote Profits Elsewhere	66	35	21	42	18	44	13	28	14	28
Subject to Union Rental Charge for Space	60	32	12	24	12	29	16	34	20	39
TOTALS	189		50		41		47		51	

Enrollment Breakdown—Under 2500—86 Unions
2500-4999—66 Unions
5000-10,000—60 Unions
Over 10,000—66 Unions

Table 73. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Guest Rooms (54 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Operated By:										
College Union Management	37	68	11	59	4	50	5	50	17	100
College Business Office	2	4	1	5	1	12.5	—		—	
Union Management & Housing Office	1	2	1	5	—		—		—	
College Housing Office	11	20	4	21	2	25	5	50	—	
Housing Office & Other	1	2	1	5	—		—		—	
Other	2	4	1	5	1	12.5	—		—	
TOTALS	54		19		8		10		17	
Guest Room Operations Are:										
Entirely Self-supporting	18		4		2		3		9	
Subsidized as to any Losses	13		6		2		3		2	
Expected to Contribute Profits to Union	19		2		2		3		12	
Expected to Direct Profits Elsewhere	8		6		1		1		—	

Table 74. Union Revenue Producing Department—Concessions (all schools)
(267 Institutions Responding)

Type of Concessions	Total	Operating Basis						Profits*					
		By Union		Commission		Space Rental		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Barber Shop	93	21	23	29	31	43	46	49	53	13	14	2	2
Beauty Shop	20	8	40	5	25	7	35	12	60	4	20	—	
Telephones	198	34	17	133	67	31	16	98	49	48	24	2	1
Juke Box	217	50	23	154	71	13	6	124	57	32	15	1	—
Western Union	16	5	31	11	69	—	—	8	50	2	13	—	
Vending Machines	267	60	22	194	73	13	5	139	52	51	19	7	3
Bank	30	15	50	5	17	10	33	19	63	1	3	1	3
Vending Machines Elsewhere on Campus	113	32	28	74	66	7	6	39	35	29	26	4	4
Pinball Machines	183	67	37	111	60	5	3	95	52	16	9	1	1
Copy Machines	133	74	56	29	21	30	23	73	55	15	11	—	
Nursery	1	1	100	—		—		1	100	—		—	
Post Office, Gov't. Sub-Station or Contract Station	61	34	56	3	5	24	39	22	36	12	20	—	
Coin-operated Laundry Machines	11	2	18	4	36	5	46	4	36	5	46	—	
Photo Developing	30	17	57	9	30	4	13	12	40	3	10	—	
Pocket Billiard Table	9	4	44	4	44	1	12	5	56	1	12	1	12
Games Room & Equipment	8	6	75	1	12.5	1	12.5	4	50	3	38	—	
Print Shop	3	2	67	—		1	33	2	67	1	33	—	
Ticket Sales	3	1	33	2	67	—		3	100	—		—	
Candy/Gift shop	6	6	100	—		—		6	100	—		—	
Lockers	1	—		1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Travel Agency	5	—		1	20	4	80	3	60	—		—	
Pharmacy	1	—		—		1	100	1	100	—		—	
Athletic Concessions	3	3	100	—		—		1	33	—		2	67

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 75. Union Revenue Producing Department—Concessions (Under 2500 enrollment)
(83 Institutions Responding)

Type of Concessions	Total	Operating Basis						Profits*					
		By Union		Commission		Space Rental		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Barber Shop	3	3	42	2	29	2	29	2	29	2	29	—	
Beauty Shop	1	1	100	—		—		—		1	100	—	
Telephones	50	10	20	26	52	14	28	17	34	17	34	1	2
Juke Box	66	19	29	45	68	2	3	30	45	14	21	1	2
Western Union	1	—		1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Vending Machines	82	19	23	59	72	4	5	41	50	17	21	2	2
Bank	9	3	33	4	45	2	22	5	55	—		—	
Vending Machines Elsewhere on Campus	29	9	31	18	62	2	7	6	21	9	31	2	7
Pinball Machines	54	21	39	31	57	2	4	20	37	10	19	—	
Copy Machines	17	10	59	4	23	3	18	7	41	5	29	—	
Nursery	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Post Office, Gov't Sub-Station or Contract Station	15	12	80	—		3	20	4	27	2	13	—	
Coin-operated Laundry Machines	5	2	40	1	20	2	40	2	40	2	40	—	
Photo Developing	4	2	50	2	50	—		—		1	25	—	
Pocket Billiard Table	4	3	75	1	25	—		3	75	1	25	—	
Games Room & Equipment	4	3	75	1	25	—		4	100	—		—	
Print Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Ticket Sales	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Candy/Gift Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Lockers	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Travel Agency	2	1	50	1	50	—		2	100	—		—	
Pharmacy	1	—		—		1	100	1	100	—		—	
Athletic Concessions	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 76. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Concessions (2500—4999 enrollment)
(63 Institutions Responding)

Type of Concessions	Total	Operating Basis						Profits*					
		By Union		Commis-sion		Space Rental		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Barber Shop	16	3	19	4	25	9	56	7	44	3	19	—	
Beauty Shop	5	2	40	1	20	2	40	2	40	2	40	—	
Telephones	46	8	17	29	63	9	20	19	41	16	35	—	
Juke Box	54	11	20	37	69	6	11	28	52	11	20	—	
Western Union	1	—		1	100	—		—		1	100	—	
Vending Machines	66	15	23	49	74	2	3	30	45	20	30	—	
Bank	6	2	33	—		4	67	4	67	—		1	17
Vending Machines Elsewhere on Campus	30	8	27	21	70	1	3	12	40	9	30	—	
Pinball Machines	43	14	33	29	67	—		24	56	3	7	1	2
Copy Machines	25	16	64	4	16	5	20	19	76	2	8	—	
Nursery	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Post Office, Gov't Sub-Station or Contract Station	7	4	57	1	14	2	29	4	57	1	14	—	
Coin-operated Laundry Machines	2	—		2	100	—		—		2	100	—	
Photo Developing	3	2	67	1	33	—		2	67	—		—	
Pool Table	3	1	33	2	67	—		2	67	—		1	33
Games Room & Equipment	3	2	67	—		1	33	—		2	67	—	
Print Shop	1	1	100	—		—		1	100	—		—	
Ticket Sales	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Candy/Gift Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Lockers	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Travel Agency	1	—		—		1	100	—		—		—	
Pharmacy	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Athletic Concessions	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 77. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Concessions (5,000–9,999 enrollment)
(58 Institutions Responding)

Type of Concessions	Total	Operating Basis						Profits*					
		By Union		Commission		Space Rental		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Barber Shop	31	4	13	7	22	20	65	14	45	6	19	—	
Beauty Shop	7	2	29	1	14	4	57	4	57	1	14	—	
Telephones	45	7	16	33	73	5	11	21	47	10	22	—	
Juke Box	45	8	18	34	75	3	7	26	58	6	13	1	2
Western Union	3	1	33	2	67	—		2	67	—		—	
Vending Machines	55	10	18	40	73	5	9	30	55	8	15	—	
Bank	12	8	67	3	25	1	8	5	42	1	8	—	
Vending Machines Elsewhere on Campus	21	4	19	14	67	3	14	6	29	8	38	—	
Pinball Machines	37	15	41	19	51	3	8	21	57	2	5	—	
Copy Machines	35	18	51	8	23	9	26	18	51	5	14	—	
Nursery	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Post Office, Gov't Sub-Station or Contract Station	10	7	70	1	10	2	20	3	30	6	60	—	
Coin-operated Laundry Machines	4	—		1	25	3	75	2	50	1	25	—	
Photo Developing	8	6	75	—		2	25	4	50	1	13	—	
Pool Table	2	1	50	1	50	—		1	50	—		—	
Games Room & Equipment	1	1	100	—		—		—		1	100	—	
Print Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Ticket Sales	1	—		1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Candy/Gift Shop	3	3	100	—		—		3	100	—		—	
Lockers	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Travel Agency	2	—		—		2	100	2	100	—		—	
Pharmacy	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Athletic Concessions	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 78. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Concessions (Over 10,000 enrollment)
(63 Institutions Responding)

Type of Concessions	Total	Operating Basis						Profits*					
		By Union		Commission		Space Rental		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Barber Shop	39	11	28	16	41	12	31	26	67	2	5	2	5
Beauty Shop	6	2	33	3	50	1	17	5	83	—		—	
Telephones	60	10	17	47	78	3	5	43	72	4	7	1	2
Juke Box	54	14	26	38	70	2	4	41	76	1	2	—	
Western Union	11	4	36	7	64	—		5	45	1	9	—	
Vending Machines	62	18	29	42	68	2	3	40	65	5	8	5	8
Bank	6	3	50	—		3	50	5	83	—		—	
Vending Machines Elsewhere on Campus	34	10	29	23	68	1	3	14	41	5	15	2	6
Pinball Machines	49	17	35	32	65	—		28	57	2	4	—	
Copy Machines	54	29	54	13	24	12	22	30	56	2	4	—	
Nursery	1	1	100	—		—		1	100	—		—	
Post Office, Gov't. Sub-Station or Contract Station	29	11	38	1	3	17	59	11	38	4	14	—	
Coin-operated Laundry Machines	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Photo Developing	15	7	47	6	40	2	13	6	40	1	7	—	
Pool Table	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Games Room & Equipment	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Print Shop	2	1	50	—		1	50	1	50	1	50	—	
Ticket Sales	2	1	50	1	50	—		2	100	—		—	
Candy/Gift Shop	3	3	100	—		—		3	100	—		—	
Lockers	1	—		1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Travel Agency	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Pharmacy	—	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Athletic Concessions	3	3	100	—		—		1	25	—		2	75

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

3

Table 79. *Union Revenue Producing Departments—Other (all schools)*
(265 Institutions Responding)

						Profits*					
		Self-Supporting		Subsidized		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
Department	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Games	236	189	80	47	20	151	64	22	9	2	1
Movies	188	87	46	101	54	61	32	23	12	1	1
Program	170	33	19	137	81	36	21	17	10	1	1
General Services/Merchandise Desk	180	121	67	59	33	109	61	7	4	—	
Hall Rentals	116	90	78	26	22	90	78	8	7	2	2
Office Rentals	51	35	69	16	31	38	75	2	4	—	
Swimming Pool-Fees	8	4	50	4	50	4	50	—		—	
Recreation Equipment Rentals (Bikes, Boats, Skis, etc.)	70	52	74	18	26	45	64	5	7	—	
School Supplies, Paper Back Books, (other than Bookstore)	37	36	97	1	3	23	62	6	16	1	3
Parking Fees	27	23	85	4	15	11	41	8	30	1	4
Craft Shop Sales	35	25	71	10	29	23	66	1	3	—	
Art Sales	49	45	92	4	8	36	73	5	10	—	
Lockers	2	2	100	—		2	100	—		—	
Audio-Visual Services	2	2	100	—		2	100	—		—	
Poster Shop	3	3	100	—		3	100	—		—	
Smoke Shop	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 80. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Other (Under 2500 enrollment)
(83 Institutions Responding)

						Profits*					
		Self-Supporting		Subsidized		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
Department	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Games	73	47	64	26	36	30	41	11	15	—	
Movies	58	16	28	42	72	9	16	1	2	1	2
Program	49	7	14	42	86	9	18	—		1	2
General Services/Merchandise Desk	48	27	56	21	44	20	42	3	6	—	
Hall Rentals	24	20	83	4	17	17	71	4	17	1	4
Office Rentals	5	4	80	1	20	3	60	1	20	—	
Swimming Pool-Fees	3	2	67	1	33	1	33	—		—	
Recreation Equipment Rentals (Bikes, Boats, Skis, etc.)	22	16	73	6	27	14	64	1	5	—	
School Supplies, Paper Back Books (other than Bookstore)	10	10	100	—		4	40	4	40	1	10
Parking Fees	5	3	60	2	40	—		3	60	1	20
Craft Shop Sales	1	1	100	—		—		1	100	—	
Art Sales	7	6	86	1	14	5	72	1	14	—	
Lockers	—	—		—		—		—		—	
Audio-Visual Services	—	—		—		—		—		—	
Poster Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—	
Smoke Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 81. *Union Revenue Producing Departments—Other (2500-4999 enrollment)*
(63 Institutions Responding)

						Profits*					
		Self-Supporting		Subsidized		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
Department	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Games	55	47	85	8	15	40	73	6	11	1	2
Movies	38	19	50	19	50	16	42	6	16	—	
Program	35	7	20	28	80	7	20	5	14	—	
General Services/Merchandise Desk	40	25	63	15	37	23	58	2	5	—	
Hall Rentals	21	18	86	3	14	16	76	2	10	1	5
Office Rentals	9	5	56	4	44	6	67	—		—	
Swimming Pool-Fees	1	—		1	100	1	100	—		—	
Recreation Equipment Rentals (Bikes, Boats, Skis, etc.)	15	12	80	3	20	10	67	1	7	—	
School Supplies, Paper Back Books (Other than Bookstore)	4	4	100	—		4	100	—		—	
Parking Fees	8	8	100	—		3	38	3	38	—	
Craft Shop Sales	5	5	100	—		4	80	—		—	
Art Sales	9	9	100	—		5	56	1	11	—	
Lockers	—	—		—		—		—		—	
Audio-Visual Services	—	—		—		—		—		—	
Poster Shop	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Smoke Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 82. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Other (5000-9999 enrollment) *(56 Institutions Responding)*

						Profits*					
		Self-Supporting		Subsidized		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
Department	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Games	51	42	82	9	18	35	69	2	4	—	
Movies	43	18	42	25	58	12	28	7	16	1	2
Program	41	6	15	35	85	9	22	3	7	—	
General Services/Merchandise Desk	41	28	68	13	32	27	66	—		—	
Hall Rentals	27	22	81	5	19	25	93	—		—	
Office Rentals	9	8	89	1	11	9	100	—		—	
Swimming Pool-Fees	—	—		—		—		—		—	
Recreation Equipment Rentals (Bikes, Boats, Skis, etc.)	19	12	63	7	37	13	68	1	5	—	
School Supplies, Paper Back Books (other than Bookstore)	13	12	92	1	8	7	54	1	8	—	
Parking Fees	4	4	100	—		2	50	2	25	—	
Craft Shop Sales	7	5	71	2	29	5	71	1	14	—	
Art Sales	14	12	86	2	14	11	79	2	14	—	
Lockers	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Audio-Visual Services	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Poster Shop	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Smoke Shop	—	—		—		—		—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table 83. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Other (Over 10,000 enrollment) (63 Institutions Responding)

						Profits*					
		Self-Supporting		Subsidized		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
Department	Total	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Games	57	53	93	4	7	47	82	3	5	—	
Movies	48	33	69	15	31	23	48	9	19	—	
Program	43	11	26	32	74	9	21	9	21	—	
General Services/Merchandise Desk	52	43	83	9	17	41	79	2	4	—	
Hall Rentals	44	30	68	14	32	32	73	1	3	—	
Office Rentals	27	17	63	10	37	19	70	1	4	—	
Swimming Pool-Fees	3	1	33	2	67	1	33	—		—	
Recreation Equipment Rentals (Bikes, Boats, Skis, etc.)	15	13	87	2	13	10	67	2	13	—	
School Supplies, Paper Back Books (other than Bookstore)	10	10	100	—		8	80	1	10	—	
Parking Fees	10	8	80	2	20	6	60	1	10	—	
Craft Shop Sales	23	15	65	8	35	14	61	—		—	
Art Sales	18	17	94	1	6	13	72	2	11	—	
Lockers	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Audio-Visual Services	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Poster Shop	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	
Smoke Shop	1	1	100	—		1	100	—		—	

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Section 5

General Union Policies

Table 84. Policy Establishment on ***General Business*** *Matters, By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(264 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	64	24	13	16	13	20	17	31	21	33	40	29	24	19	47	27	17	19
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	2	1	—		—		—		2	3	2	1	—		2	1	—	
Union Staff & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Staff & Student Government	1	—	—		1	1.5	—		—		—		1	1	1	.5	—	
Union Staff, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	1	—	—		—		1	2	—		1	1	—		1	.5	—	
Union Staff & Other	2	1	—		—		—		2	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Business Office	40	15	16	20	10	16	6	11	8	13	16	12	24	19	30	17	10	12
Coordinated Union-Business Office	129	49	44	54	36	56	25	45	24	38	66	47	63	50	77	44	52	59
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	4	2	2	2	—		—		2	3	2	1	2	1.6	2	1	2	2
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	3	1	1	1	—		1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1.6	3	2	—	
Coordinated & Other	2	1	2	2	—		—		—		—		2	1.6	—		2	2
Union Policy Board	10	4	4	5	1	1.5	3	5	2	3	7	5	3	2	6	3	4	5

Table 84. Continued

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University Governing Board	3	1	—		2	3	1	2	—		2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
*Other	1	—	—		1	1.5	—		—		—		1	1	1	.5	—	
TOTALS	264		82		64		55		63		139		125		176		88	

*Many checked the "other" category, but seldom provided an explanation possibly due to the short space provided and the construction of that portion of the questionnaire.

Table 85. Policy Establishment on Purchasing Procedures, By Enrollment, Age and Type (267 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	30	11	4	5	7	11	11	19	8	13	22	15	8	7	26	15	4	5
Union Staff & Student Government	1	—	—		1	1.5	—		—		—		1	.8	1	.5	—	
Union Staff & Other	5	2	2	2	1	1.5	1	1.7	1	1.5	2	1	3	2	4	2	1	1
Business Office	102	38	30	37	28	44	21	37	23	36	53	37	49	40	70	39	32	37
Coordinated Union-Business Office	112	42	43	53	25	39	21	37	23	36	60	42	52	42	66	37	46	53
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	2	1	1	1	—		—		1	1.5	—		2	2	1	.5	1	1
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		—		2	3	1	1	1	.8	2	1	—	
Coordinated & Other	2	1	1	1	—		1	1.7	—		—		2	2	1	.5	1	1
Union Policy Board	1	—	—		—		—		1	1.5	1	1	—		1	.5	—	
University Governing Board	5	2	—		1	1.5	2	4	2	3	2	1	3	2	4	2	1	1
Other	5	2	1	1	1	1.5	—		3	5	3	2	2	2	4	2	1	1
TOTALS	267		82		64		57		64		144		123		180		87	

*Table 86. Policy Establishment on **Profit Goals** By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(242 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	52	21	11	15	6	11	13	27	22	35	35	27	17	15	43	26	9	12
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	13	5	—		3	5	1	2	9	14	8	6	5	4	12	7	1	1
Union Staff & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	1.5	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	2	1	—		—		—		2	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Business Office	30	12	14	20	9	16	4	8	3	5	14	11	16	14	15	9	15	20
Business Office & University Governing Board	1	.5	—		—		—		1	1.5	1	1	—		1	.6	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	94	39	34	47	27	47	20	41	13	21	45	34	49	44	56	34	38	50
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	3	1	1	1	—		1	2	1	1.5	3	2	—		3	2	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	4	2	1	1	—		1	2	2	3	1	1	3	3	3	2	1	1
Coordinated & Other	1	.5	1	1	—		—		—		1	1	—		1	.6	—	
Union Policy Board	20	8	5	7	4	7	5	10	6	10	13	10	7	6	15	9	5	7

Table 86. Continued

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University Governing Board	10	4	1	1	3	5	3	6	3	5	3	2	7	6	7	4	3	4
Other	4	2	2	3	2	4	—		—		1	1	3	3	3	2	1	1
Non-Profit	6	2	3	4	3	5	—		—		3	2	3	3	3	2	3	4
TOTALS	242		73		57		49		63		130		112		166		76	

*Table 87. Policy Establishment on **Food** Prices By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(258 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	44	17	10	13	3	5	11	20	20	33	35	25	9	7	36	21	8	9
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	12	5	—		3	5	3	5	6	10	5	4	7	6	11	6	1	1
Union Staff & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	3	1	—		—		2	4	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	1	—	
Business Office	67	26	29	36	24	38	5	8	9	14	27	19	40	33	28	16	39	46
Coordinated Union-Business Office	54	21	17	21	12	19	13	23	12	20	30	21	24	20	36	21	18	22
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	1	—	1	1	—		—		—		1	1	—		1	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	2	3	—		—		—		—		2	2	1	1	1	1
Coordinated Union-Business Office, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	1	—	—		—		—		1	2	1	1	—		1	1	—	
Coordinated & Other	3	1	2	3	—		1	2	—		1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2
Union Policy Board	20	8	4	5	3	5	7	12	6	10	13	9	7	6	19	11	1	1

Table 87. Continued

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University Governing Board	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	—		1	1	3	2	2	1	2	2
*Other	45	17	14	17	16	26	11	20	4	7	22	16	23	19	31	18	14	16
TOTALS	258		80		62		56		60		138		120		172		86	

*These included sources such as caterers, and food services such as SAGA.

Table 88. *Policy Establishment on* **Bookstore** *Prices By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(208 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	31	15	9	13	2	4	8	20	12	28	22	22	9	8	26	18	5	7
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	6	3	—		1	2	2	5	3	7	3	3	3	3	5	4	1	1
Union Staff & University Governing Board	1	.4	—		—		1	2	—		1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	1	.4	—		—		—		1	2	1	1	—		1	1	—	
Business Office	92	44	37	52	30	58	11	27	14	33	34	35	58	53	50	36	42	60
Business Office & University Governing Board	1	.4	—		—		—		1	2	1	1	—		1	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	27	13	14	19	7	13	4	10	2	5	12	12	15	14	15	10	12	17
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	1	.4	1	1	—		—		—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	1	.4	—		—		—		1	2	1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Policy Board	4	2	—		—		3	7	1	2	3	3	1	1	4	3	—	
University Governing Board	1	.4	—		—		1	2	—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
*Other	42	20	11	15	12	23	11	27	8	19	21	21	21	19	31	23	11	15
TOTALS	208		72		52		41		43		99		109		137		71	

*Those included institutional foundations and publisher's requirements.

*Table 89. Policy Establishment on Reserve for **Repair and Replacement** By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(254 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	44	17	6	8	8	13	11	20	19	32	32	23	12	10	40	23	4	5
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	8	3	—		1	2	2	4	5	8	6	4	2	2	7	4	1	1
Union Staff & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	3	1	1	1	—		1	2	1	2	—		3	3	2	1	1	1
Business Office	70	28	33	42	21	34	13	24	3	5	24	17	46	39	36	20	34	42
Coordinated Union-Business Office	93	37	33	42	19	31	21	38	20	33	55	41	38	32	58	34	35	43
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	1	—	—		1	2	—		—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	4	2	1	1	—		—		3	5	3	2	1	1	4	2	—	
Union Policy Board	12	5	3	5	3	4	2	4	4	7	8	6	4	4	10	6	2	3
University Governing Board	11	4	1	1	6	10	2	4	2	3	6	4	5	4	8	5	3	4
*Other	6	2	—		3	4	1	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	5	3	1	1
TOTALS	254		78		62		54		60		138		116		173		81	

*Included School Comptroller.

Table 90. Policy Establishment on Employee Wage Levels By Enrollment, Age and Type (261 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	18	7	3	4	6	9	5	9	4	6	8	6	10	8	14	8	4	5
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	3	1	—		—		2	3	1	2	3	2	—		3	2	—	
Union Staff & University Governing Board	4	2	—		—		1	2	3	5	3	2	1	1	4	2	—	
Union Staff & Other	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	—		2	2	2	1	—	
Business Office	88	34	37	48	17	27	14	25	20	30	43	31	45	38	48	26	40	49
Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	1	1	1	2	—		—		1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	74	28	29	37	21	34	15	26	9	14	37	26	37	30	45	25	29	35
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	1	—	—		—		—		1	2	1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Policy Board	8	3	1	1	1	2	4	7	2	3	6	4	2	2	7	4	1	1
University Governing Board	30	11	3	4	8	13	6	10	13	20	19	13	11	9	26	15	4	5
*Other	29	11	4	5	8	13	8	14	9	14	19	13	10	8	25	14	4	5
TOTALS	261		78		62		57		64		141		120		179		82	

*Indicated that governmental wage guidelines were a factor.

Table 91. Policy Establishment on Employee Benefits By Enrollment, Age and Type (262 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	7	3	—		3	5	2	4	2	3	4	3	3	2	7	4	—	
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	1.5	2	1	—		2	1	—	
Union Staff & University Governing Board	1	—	—		—		1	2	—		1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	1.5	—		2	2	2	1	—	
Business Office	123	47	51	63	28	45	20	34	24	37	61	43	62	51	67	37	56	67
Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	1	1	1	2	—		—		1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	51	19	18	23	12	20	13	23	8	13	26	18	25	21	35	19	16	20
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	1	—	—		—		—		1	1.5	—		1	1	1	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	1	—	—		—		—		1	1.5	1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Policy Board	7	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	5	6	4	1	1	5	3	2	2
University Governing Board	33	13	4	5	7	11	7	12	15	23	22	15	11	9	29	16	4	5
*Other	32	12	4	5	9	15	11	19	8	13	18	13	14	12	27	15	5	6
TOTALS	262		80		61		57		64		142		120		179		83	

*Indicated that State Governments and Employee Relations Councils played a part.

*Table 92. Policy Establishment on **Student Fees** By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(238 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	3	1	1	1	2	4	—		—		1	1	2	2	1	1	2	3
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	3	1	1	1	1	1.6	—		1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Union Staff & Other	2	1	—		—		—		2	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Business Office	58	24	24	34	10	18	13	24	11	18	26	20	32	28	32	19	26	38
Business Office & University Governing Board	3	1	—		1	1.6	2	4	—		2	2	1	1	3	2	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	40	17	12	18	12	21	8	15	8	14	23	18	17	15	27	16	13	19
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	7	3	2	3	2	4	2	4	1	2	4	3	3	3	5	3	2	3
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	—		1	1.6	—		1	2	2	2	—		2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 92. Continued

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Coordinated & Other	2	1	—		—		2	4	—		1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Policy Board	12	5	2	3	5	8	3	6	2	3	7	6	5	4	10	6	2	3
Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	3	1	—		1	1.6	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	3	2	—	
University Governing Board	62	27	18	26	14	25	8	15	22	38	35	28	27	23	47	27	15	22
*Other	39	16	10	14	8	14	13	24	8	14	17	13	22	19	32	19	7	10
TOTALS	238		70		57		53		58		124		114		169		69	

*Indicated use of Student Government, Budget Committees, and State Government.

*Table 93. Policy Establishment on **Reserve Fund** Deposits, By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(220 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	12	5	1	2	3	6	3	6	5	9	10	9	2	2	12	8	—	
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	7	3	—		2	4	1	2	4	7	5	4	2	2	6	4	1	2
Union Staff & University Governing Board	1	1	1	2	—		—		—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	2	1	—		—		—		2	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Business Office	95	43	36	58	20	40	20	40	19	33	43	38	52	48	52	33	43	66
Business Office & Union Policy Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	47	21	10	16	11	22	13	26	13	23	27	24	20	18	37	23	10	15
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	1	1	—		—		1	2	—		1	1	—		1	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	4	2	2	3	—		1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2
Union Policy Board	8	3	3	5	2	4	2	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	6	4	2	3
Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	1	1	—		—		—		1	2	1	1	—		1	1	—	

Table 93. Continued

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University Governing Board	22	10	3	5	6	12	7	14	6	10	10	9	12	11	18	12	4	6
Other*	18	8	6	9	6	12	1	2	5	9	7	6	11	10	14	9	4	6
TOTALS	220		62		50		50		58		112		108		155		65	

*Indicated use of school comptroller.

Table 94. *Policy Establishment on Building Use By Enrollment, Age and Type (264 Institutions Responding)*

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	56	21	29	36	12	18	10	17	5	8	28	19	28	23	25	14	31	36
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	36	14	4	5	13	20	5	9	14	22	23	16	13	10	32	18	4	5
Union Staff & University Governing Board	15	6	6	8	1	2	3	5	5	8	9	6	6	5	11	6	4	5
Union Staff & Student Government	1	—	—		1	2	—		—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
Union Staff, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		2	4	—		2	1	—		2	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	3	1	1	1	—		1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
Business Office	3	1	—		2	3	1	2	—		2	1	1	1	3	2	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	18	7	9	11	4	6	3	5	2	3	8	6	10	8	10	5	8	9
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	2	1	1	1	—		—		1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	1	—	1	1	—		—		—		—		1	1	—		1	1

Table 94. Continued

Established By:	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Coordinated Union-Business Office, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Policy Board	94	35	21	27	22	34	23	41	28	43	57	40	37	31	66	37	28	33
University Governing Board	24	9	4	5	9	13	6	11	5	8	9	6	15	13	18	10	6	7
*Other	7	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	4	3	5	3	2	2
TOTALS	264		80		65		56		63		144		120		178		86	

*Indicated compliance with regulations from agencies such as the fire marshall and police department concerning safety. Also work jointly with the community with utilizing off-campus buildings.

*Table 95. Policy Establishment on **Program** By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(269 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	51	19	25	29	13	20	7	12	6	10	26	19	25	21	23	13	28	33
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	37	14	8	9	12	18	6	11	11	19	16	11	21	17	26	15	11	12
Union Staff & University Governing Board	12	4	3	3	2	3	5	9	2	3	5	4	7	6	9	5	3	4
Union Staff & Student Government	2	1	1	1	1	1.5	—		—		1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Staff, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	2	1	—		1	1.5	1	2	—		1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	10	4	3	3	1	1.5	3	6	3	5	8	6	2	2	6	3	4	5
Coordinated Union-Business Office	8	3	5	6	1	1.5	2	3	—		3	2	5	4	4	2	4	5
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	1	—	—		1	1.5	—		—		1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Policy Board	88	33	26	29	16	25	19	35	27	45	51	36	37	31	64	37	24	28
Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	3	1	—		—		1	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	2	—	
University Governing Board	36	13	15	17	10	15	7	12	4	7	15	10	11	9	17	10	9	11

Table 95. Continued

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University Governing Board & Other	1	—	—		—		1	2	—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
*Other	18	7	3	3	7	11	3	6	5	8	11	8	7	6	16	9	2	2
TOTALS	269		89		65		55		60		140		119		174		85	

*Indicated student involvement via program boards and councils, joint committees and student government.

*Table 96. Policy Establishment on **Building Development** Plans, By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(248 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	26	10	6	9	5	8	8	14	7	11	21	15	5	5	18	10	8	11
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	24	10	3	4	6	10	5	8	10	16	12	9	12	11	18	10	6	8
Union Staff & University Governing Board	12	5	2	3	3	5	2	3.5	5	8	7	5	5	5	11	7	1	1
Union Staff & Student Government	1	—	—		1	2	—		—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
Union Staff, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	2	1	—		—		2	3.5	—		2	1	—		2	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	5	2	—		2	3	1	2	2	3	1	1	4	4	5	3	—	
Business Office	11	4	6	9	2	3	2	3.5	1	2	3	2	8	7	4	2	7	9
Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	—		2	3	—		—		—		2	1	2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	72	29	29	43	19	31	12	21	12	21	36	26	36	33	42	24	30	40
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	13	6	3	4	3	5	2	3.5	5	8	8	6	5	5	9	5	4	5
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	5	2	—		—		1	2	4	7	3	2	2	1	4	2	1	1

Table 96. Continued

Established By:	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972		Public		Private	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Coordinated Union-Business Office, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	9	4	1	1	2	3	1	2	5	8	6	4	3	3	8	5	1	1
Coordinated & Other	1	—	—		—		1	2	—		1	1	—		1	1	—	
Union Policy Board	24	10	5	7	4	7	8	14	7	11	17	13	7	6	19	12	5	7
Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	1	—	1	1	—		—		—		1	1	—		—		1	1
University Governing Board	26	10	8	12	8	13	8	14	2	3	14	10	12	11	18	10	8	11
*Other	14	6	5	7	4	7	4	7	1	2	6	4	8	7	10	6	4	5
TOTALS	248		69		61		57		61		138		110		172		76	

*Indicated use of consultants and governmental regulations.

Table 97. Policy Establishment on Disposition of ***Operating Surpluses*** *By Enrollment, Age and Type*
(240 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
Established By:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Staff	18	8	2	3	2	4	6	10	8	14	17	13	1	1	17	10	1	1
Union Staff & Union Policy Board	16	7	2	3	2	4	2	3	10	17	12	9	4	4	16	10	—	
Union Staff & University Governing Board	2	1	1	1	1	2	—		—		—		2	2	1	1	1	1
Union Staff & Student Government	1	—	—		1	2	—		—		—		1	1	1	1	—	
Union Staff & Other	4	2	—		1	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	3	3	4	2	—	
Business Office	58	24	28	39	13	24	12	22	5	9	25	19	33	30	28	17	30	41
Business Office & University Governing Board	2	1	1	1	—		—		1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	—	
Coordinated Union-Business Office	70	29	24	34	17	31	20	34	9	15	34	26	36	32	43	26	27	37
Coordinated Union-Business Office & Union Policy Board	6	3	—		2	4	1	2	3	5	4	3	2	2	5	2	1	1
Coordinated Union-Business Office & University Governing Board	5	2	1	1	—		—		4	7	2	2	3	3	5	2	—	

Table 97. Continued

Established By:	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union				Type of School			
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972		Public		Private	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Coordinated Union-Business Office, Union Policy Board & University Governing Board	2	1	1	1	—		—		1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Coordinated & Other	2	1	—		—		1	2	1	2	2	2	—		2	1	—	
Union Policy Board	21	8	5	8	4	7	7	12	5	9	15	11	6	5	16	10	5	7
University Governing Board	20	8	5	8	4	7	6	10	5	9	10	8	10	9	16	10	4	6
Other	13	5	1	1	7	13	1	2	4	7	6	4	7	6	10	6	3	5
TOTALS	240		71		54		58		57		130		110		167		73	

Table 98. Use of ***Facilities*** *for Union Program, By Enrollment*
(270 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Program Held Entirely Within Union	45	17	17	21	10	15	11	19	7	11
Other College Facilities Supplement Union's Facilities	222	82	65	79	55	85	48	81	54	84
Programming Done by Other Agency	3	1	—		—		—		3	5
TOTALS	270		82		65		59		64	

Table 99. ***Other Facilities*** *Used to Supplement Union's Facilities, By Enrollment*
(222 Institutions Responding 65—under 2500; 55—2500-4999; 48—5000-10,000; 54—Over 10,000)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility Used	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Theatre	35	16	11	17	11	20	4	8	9	17
Auditorium	107	48	26	40	27	49	23	48	31	57
Field House, Gym or Coliseum	119	54	38	58	30	55	25	52	26	48
Fine Arts Building	15	7	4	6	5	9	3	6	3	6
Dining Hall	18	8	9	14	6	11	2	4	1	2
Library, Learning Resources Center	6	3	2	3	2	4	2	4	—	
Stadium, Ball Fields	17	8	1	2	6	11	5	10	5	9
Skating Rink	4	2	1	2	2	4	—		1	2
Movie House	3	1	1	2	—		—		2	4
Dorms, Recreation Areas or Lounges	33	15	12	18	11	20	5	10	5	9
*University Recreation Areas	29	13	5	8	8	15	7	15	9	17
Classrooms	33	15	9	14	8	15	5	10	11	20
Swimming Pool	4	2	1	2	—		1	2	2	4
University Lecture Center, Lecture Halls	25	11	2	3	8	15	10	21	5	9
City Auditorium, Civic Center	9	4	1	2	2	4	1	2	5	9
Chapel	10	5	5	8	5	9	—		—	
Recreation Facilities, Private or City	23	10	5	8	6	11	8	17	4	7
Coffee House	16	7	4	6	3	5	4	8	5	9
TOTALS	506		137		140		105		124	

*College owned areas such as playing fields, swimming pools, lodges.

Table 100. **Responsibility** *for Union Program Planning and Execution, By Enrollment*

(267 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Planned Program	7	3	2	2	3	5	2	3	—	
Program Planned and Executed by Professional Staff	10	4	5	6	1	2	2	3	2	3
Program Planned and Executed by Co-ordinated Effort of Program Board, Committees and Staff	238	88	75	87	55	87	53	91	55	94
*Other	12	5	4	5	4	6	2	3	2	3
TOTALS	267		86		63		59		59	

*Indicated emphasis upon student involvement such as student government, student committees, and program board only.

Table 101. Constituency of Union Programs, By Enrollment (274 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Students Only	31	11	11	13	5	8	10	16	5	8
All Members of College Community (Alumni included)	243	89	74	87	61	92	52	84	56	92
TOTALS	274		85		66		62		61	
Townspeople in Addition to above	48	18	15	18	12	18	12	19	9	15
Other-(no planned program)	1		1		—		—		—	

Table 102. Total Cost of Free Union Programs, By Enrollment (218 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under $500	2	1	2	3	—		—		—	
$500-$999	3	1	—		2	4	1	2	—	
$1,000-$1,999	7	3	4	6	—		3	6	—	
$2,000-$2,999	5	2	3	5	1	2	1	2	—	
$3,000-$4,999	21	10	11	17	5	10	3	6	2	4
$5,000-$7,499	13	6	6	9	2	4	4	9	1	2
$7,500-$9,999	17	8	6	9	6	11	2	4	3	6
$10,000-$19,000	47	22	12	18	13	25	10	22	12	23
$20,000-$29,999	35	16	12	18	5	9	10	22	8	15
$30,000-$39,999	18	8	3	5	6	11	3	6	6	11
$40,000-$50,000	17	8	3	5	6	11	3	6	5	9
Over $50,000	33	15	3	5	7	13	7	15	16	30
TOTALS	218		65		53		47		53	

*Table 103. Cost of **Free** Union Programs Per Full-Time Day Student,*
By Enrollment
(218 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Cost	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under $1.00	37	17	3	5	5	10	12	26	17	32
$1-1.99	39	18	10	15	4	7	8	17	17	32
$2-2.99	22	10	3	5	6	11	8	17	5	9
$3-3.99	21	10	5	8	7	13	4	9	5	9
$4-4.99	21	10	7	11	8	15	3	6	3	6
$5-5.99	35	16	15	22	9	17	8	17	3	6
$10-14.99	22	10	7	11	10	19	3	6	2	4
$15-20	8	3	5	8	2	4	—	—	1	2
Over $20	13	6	10	15	2	4	1	2	—	—
TOTALS	218		65		53		47		53	

*Table 104. Annual **Surplus** From Union **Revenue Producing** Programs,*
By Enrollment
(51 Institutions Responding; 18% of Total)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Surplus	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under $500	3	6	2	17	—		—		1	5
$500-999	8	15	4	33	—		1	8	3	13.6
$1,000-1,999	6	12	3	25	—		1	8	2	9
$2,000-2,999	9	18	1	8	2	40	4	34	2	9
$3,000-4,999	8	15	2	17	—		2	17	4	18
$5,000-7,499	4	8	—		—		—		4	18
$7,500-9,999	4	8	—		1	20	2	17	1	5
$10,000-19,999	6	12	—		2	40	1	8	3	13.6
Over $20,000	3	6	—		—		1	8	2	9
*TOTALS	51		12		5		12		22	

*Some institutions indicated a "break even" situation which is not included in this table.

Table 105. *Annual **Deficit** From Union **Revenue Producing** Programs, By Enrollment*
(119 Institutions Responding; 43% of Total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Deficit	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under $500	2	2	—		1	3	—		1	4
$500-999	4	3	3	7	1	3	—		—	
$1,000-1,999	5	4	2	5	1	3	—		2	8
$2,000-2,999	13	11	5	13	3	8	4	20	1	4
$3,000-4,999	13	11	10	25	1	3	—		2	8
$5,000-7,499	24	20	8	20	12	34	1	5	3	13
$7,500-9,999	6	5	2	5	2	6	1	5	1	4
$10,000-19,999	25	21	7	18	4	11	8	40	6	25
Over $20,000	27	23	3	7	10	29	6	30	8	34
*TOTALS	119		40		35		20		24	

*Some institutions indicated a "break even" situation which is not included in this table.

Table 106. *Student Organization Office Space by **Permanent Lease**, By Enrollment*
(112 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Number of Organizations	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-3	54	48	14	42	19	59	7	35	14	52
4-6	35	31	13	39	7	22	8	40	7	26
7-10	10	9	4	13	—	—	4	20	2	7
11-15	7	6	1	3	4	13	1	5	1	4
16-20	4	4	—	—	1	3	—	—	3	11
Over 20	2	2	1	3	1	3	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	112		33		32		20		27	

Table 107. Student Organization Office Space by ***Annual Renewal,*** *By Enrollment* *(92 Institutions Responding)*

			Enrollment							
Number of Organizations	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-3	29	32	7	39	5	26	10	42	7	23
4-6	14	15	2	11	4	21	5	21	3	10
7-10	17	18	3	16.6	6	32	1	4	7	23
11-15	12	13	3	16.6	—	—	4	17	5	16
16-20	8	9	1	6	1	5	2	8	4	12
Over 20	12	13	2	11	3	16	2	8	5	16
TOTALS	92		18		19		24		31	

Table 108. Student Organization Office Space for Special Activities Assigned for Short Term Use, By Enrollment (36 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
Number of Organizations	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-3	19	53	5	71	5	83	5	56	4	29
4-6	8	22	2	29	1	17	2	22	3	21
7-10	3	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	21
11-15	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	8
16-20	1	3	—	—	—	—	1	11	—	—
Over 20	4	11	—	—	—	—	1	11	3	21
TOTALS	36		7		6		9		14	

Table 109. Use of (Non-Union) Office Space ***Equipment****, By Enrollment*
(234 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Provides All Office Equipment	63	27	28	40	15	29	11	22	9	14
Union Provides No Office Equipment	54	23	15	21	13	25	12	24	14	23
Union Provides Limited Office Equipment	117	50	27	39	24	46	27	54	39	63
TOTALS	234		70		52		50		62	

Table 110. (Non-Union) Office Space ***Maintenance****, By Enrollment*
(230 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union Provides Normal Maintenance for Office Holders	216	94	60	91	51	93	49	98	56	95
Union Provides No Maintenance for Office Holders	14	6	6	9	4	7	1	2	3	5
TOTALS	230		66		55		50		59	

*Table 111. Student Organizations **Office Rental Fees,** by Enrollment**
(37 Institutions Responding; 13% of Total)

Student Organizations	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Student Government	16	43	6	3	1	6
Student Publications	8	22	2	3	—	3
Clubs & Organizations	16	43	2	1	3	10
Special Events	10	27	1	6	1	2
Draft Counseling	1	3	—	1	—	—
Union Board	1	3	1	—	—	—
Residence Hall	1	3	—	—	—	1
TOTALS	53		12	14	5	22

*Based on only those unions that had a charge

*Table 112. Administrative Departments **Office Rental Fee***
(33 Institutions Responding; 12% of Total)

	Total Unions	
	No.	%
Student Personnel Services	3	9
College Administrative Departments	5	15
Student Health	2	6
Public Relations	1	3
Alumni Association	4	12
Student Relations	3	9
Foundations	2	6
Classes Broadcast	3	9
Auxiliary Services	1	3
Activities Offices	5	15
Academic Departments	2	6
Faculty Advisor	1	3
Conferences	9	27
TOTALS	41	
Other Departments (Rental Fee Charged)		
Community Organizations	13	87
University Club	2	13
TOTALS	15	

Table 113. ***Responsibility*** *for Union Maintenance Staff, By Enrollment and Age*
(273 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Maintenance staff primarily responsible to the University Maintenance Department	146	53	64	74	39	62	29	48	14	22	62	44	84	63
Maintenance staff primarily responsible to Union Management	129	47	23	26	24	38	32	52	50	78	80	56	49	37
*TOTALS	275		87		63		61		64		142		133	

*Some institutions indicated an even degree of responsibility and checked both columns.

Table 114. Financing Union Maintenance ***Salaries****, By Enrollment and Age*
(273 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Salaries of Maintenance Staff charged to general University budget	71	26	33	36	15	22	10	16	13	17	28	17	43	32
Salaries of Maintenance Staff charged to Maintenance Department	61	22	27	30	16	24	9	14	9	12	31	19	30	22
Salaries of Maintenance Staff charged to Union	142	52	24	26	31	46	37	59	50	66	88	55	54	39
Union Shares part of the salary expense of its Maintenance Staff	24	9	7	8	6	8	7	11	4	5	14	9	10	7
*TOTALS	298		91		68		63		76		161		137	

*Some institutions checked more than one column.

*Table 115. Financing Union Maintenance **Supplies**, By Enrollment and Age*
(257 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Maintenance supplies furnished by Mainenance Department	109	42	46	61	29	50	23	39	11	17	41	31	68	55
Maintenance supplies paid for by the Union	148	58	30	39	29	50	36	61	53	83	92	69	56	45
TOTALS	257		76		58		59		64		133		124	

Table 116. Financing Building ***Repairs****, By Enrollment and Age*
(267 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union			
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963-1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Repairs paid for by the Maintenance Department	91	34	35	45	27	47	15	26	14	19	41	28	50	42
Repairs paid for by the Union	176	66	42	55	31	53	42	74	61	81	107	72	69	58
TOTALS	267		77		58		57		75		148		119	

Table 117. Extent of Specialized, Full-time Union Maintenance Positions, By Enrollment
(169 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Position	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Building Engineer	57	34	3	8	16	30
Electrician	20	12	—	3	4	13
Carpenter	15	9	—	2	5	8
Plumber	8	5	—	1	3	4
Mechanic	47	28	3	9	10	25
Painter	9	5	—	—	2	7
Air Condition Mechanic	1	1	—	—	—	1
Sound Technician	25	15	2	2	3	18
Building Supervisor	14	8	2	1	6	5
*General Laborer						

*Omitted due to non-specialized nature of the position even though several indicated this position.

Table 118. ***Miscellaneous*** *Services Available in Unions (252 Institutions Responding)*

			Enrollment							
			(75 Unions)		(62 Unions)		(56 Unions)		(59 Unions)	
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
Service	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Bulletin Board Space	252	100	75	100	62	100	56	100	59	100
Lost & Found Department	238	94	69	92	58	94	54	96	57	97
Ticket Sales	233	92	68	91	55	89	54	96	56	95
Travel Board	189	75	47	63	42	68	47	84	53	90
PA Announcements	167	66	49	65	46	74	43	77	29	49
Record Library	81	32	22	29	12	19	17	30	30	51
Typing-Duplicating	133	53	33	44	36	58	28	50	36	61
Check Cashing	135	54	34	45	27	44	29	52	45	80
Free Telephones	139	55	37	49	26	42	34	61	42	71
Clearing House for Talent	102	40	36	48	29	47	17	30	20	34
Print & Painting Library	60	24	9	12	18	29	12	21	21	36
Western Union	12	5	1	1	2	3	4	7	5	8
Copy Machines	120	48	13	16	31	50	35	63	41	69
Personal Notices Board	201	80	58	77	52	84	45	80	46	78
General Travel Service	99	39	29	39	23	37	25	45	22	37
Master Calendar of Campus Events	189	75	60	80	49	79	41	73	39	66
General Campus Information	229	91	67	89	51	82	52	93	59	100
Mail Boxes for Student Organizations	187	74	51	68	43	69	42	75	51	86
Message Slots for Individual Students	39	15	19	25	8	13	8	14	4	7
Directory Services (phone numbers & addresses of students)	152	60	43	57	39	63	38	68	32	54
Postage Selling, Weighing	95	38	32	43	16	26	20	36	27	46
Sign and Poster Making	176	70	40	53	47	76	41	73	58	98
Beer Service	51	20	11	15	14	23	11	20	15	25
Liquor Service	31	12	7	9	8	13	6	11	10	17

Table 118. Continued

Service	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Outdoor Recreation Equipment Rentals	59	23	14	19	13	21	18	32	14	24
Baby Sitting or Day Care Center	15	6	3	4	5	8	5	9	2	3
Special Charter Flights	58	23	8	11	15	24	15	27	20	34
Guided Campus Tours	69	27	15	20	16	26	17	30	21	36
Storage Lockers or Closets for Student Organizations	137	54	35	47	30	48	35	63	37	63
Postage Vending Machines	78	31	15	20	13	21	16	29	34	58

Table 119. Equipment Loaned for Use ***Outside*** *the Union Building*
(207 Institutions Responding)

*Kind of Equipment	Unions with Loan Policy		Unions Charging for Loan	
	No.	%	No.	%
Tables	129	62	7	5
Chairs	117	57	7	6
Kitchen Utensils, etc.	57	28	6	11
Recreation Equipment	91	44	6	7
P. A. Equipment	106	51	14	13
Movie, Slide Projectors	71	34	7	10
Office Machines	14	7	1	7
Piano	1	—	—	—
Chair Risers	4	2	—	—
Spotlights	8	4	3	38
Tape Recorder	2	1	—	—

*Emphasis is on OUTSIDE loans and the table could have been misread by many because so many make loans but so very few charge for usage.

Section 6

Relationship to Other

Table 120. Facilities Used By General Campus Activities (Non-Union), By Enrollment
(273 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
Facilities	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Separate Building on Campus	37	20	15	25	5	12	8	20	9	20
Headquarters in Union	150	80	45	75	37	88	32	80	36	80
TOTALS	187		60		42		40		45	
Combination of numerous facilities on campus, including Union	119		42		30		25		22	

*The nature of this table led to multiple responses per school at times, thus making the totals larger than the number of schools participating.

Table 121. Management Responsibility for General Campus Activities (Non-Union), By Enrollment
(275 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
Management	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-Union personnel Responsible for General Student Activities	66	35	8	14	13	29	13	35	32	65
Union Director Doubles as Head of General Student Activities	121	65	48	86	32	71	24	65	17	35
TOTALS	187		56		45		37		49	
Combination of Union and Non-Union Personnel Responsible for General Student Activities	107		31		23		31		22	

*The nature of this table led to multiple responses per school at times, thus making the totals larger than the number of schools participating.

Table 122. Nature of **Non-Union** *Program of Activities, By Enrollment (160 Institutions Responding)*

Nature of Non-Union Program	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Conducted independently from Union Program	63	39	9	20	7	25	19	56	28	52
Correlated with Union Program	97	61	35	80	21	75	15	44	26	48
TOTALS	160		44		28		34		54	

*Responses on third question on "union program as a part of general student activities" excluded because of its misleading structure. This is why total number of responses is low.

Table 123. Relationship of Union and Student Government, By Enrollment (274 Institutions Responding)

Relationship	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Union operated independently of Student Government	95	61	25	48	15	39	22	81	33	83
Union is agency of Student Government	62	39	27	52	23	61	5	19	7	17
TOTALS	157		52		38		27		40	
Union operates independently of but maintains close liaison with Student Government	142		42		28		38		34	

*The nature of this table led to multiple responses per school at times, thus making the totals larger than the number of schools participating.

Table 124. Facilities Used for Campus Adult Education Program,
By Enrollment
(221 Institutions Responding)

Facilities Available to Program	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Separate Adult Education Center used	40	18	12	23	7	15	7	13	14	21
Union primarily used	144	65	38	72	34	74	34	61	38	58
Combination of Campus facilities (including union) used	37	17	3	5	5	11	15	26	14	21
TOTALS	221		53		46		56		66	

Table 125. Personnel Responsible for Campus Adult Education
Program, By Enrollment
(189 Institutions Responding)

Management	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-Union personnel responsible for organizing adult education	150	79	29	67	41	85	37	79	43	84
Union director and/or staff responsible for organizing and servicing adult ed. program	9	5	3	7	3	6	3	6	—	—
Combination of union and non-union personnel responsible for adult education program	30	16	11	26	4	9	7	15	8	16
TOTALS	189		43		48		47		51	

Table 126. Special Services Available to Campus Adult Education Program
(144 Institutions Responding; 52% of Total)

Special Services Rendered	No. of Unions
Registration	34
Typing and Duplicating	24
Information Center	48
Clerical Personnel for Various Conference Functions	16
Transportation	3
Western Union	3
Meeting Supplies and Equipment	29

*The following figures do not necessarily relate to the list of services above. Many responded by checking only those below and not listing any of the above services which accounts for the variation in responses.

34-administered by Union

173 services administered by separate Adult Education Center or Other Campus Department

Table 127. Union Facilities Used for Campus Adult Education Program (220 Institutions Responding; 79% of Total)

Facility	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Charge For Use No.	Charge For Use %
Meeting Rooms	220	100	55	25
Committee Rooms	185	84	32	17
Auditorium	185	84	19	10
Theatre	46	21	10	22
Cafeteria	169	77	11	7
Snack Bar	193	88	9	5
Banqueting Facilities	169	77	19	11
Guest Rooms	35	16	—	—
Lounges	214	97	6	3
Ballroom	139	63	39	28
Games Area	189	86	27	14
Faculty Dining Room	14	6	1	7
Restaurant-type Waiter Service Dining Room	31	14	7	23
Music Room	23	10	—	—
Gift Shop	7	3	—	—
Bookstore	21	10	—	—
Swimming Pool	4	2	1	25
TV Room	15	7	—	—
Post Office	8	4	—	—
Coffee House	5	2	—	—
Radio Station	3	1	1	33
Print Shop	2	1	—	—
Counseling Room	1	1	—	—
Art Gallery	9	4	—	—
Craft Shop	11	5	—	—

Table 128. Union Responsibility for Certain Business Procedures in Relation to College Business Office, By Enrollment and Age
(236 Institutions Responding)

Business Procedure	Total Unions		Enrollment								Age of Union			
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000		Before 1962		1963–1972	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Prepares own budget for submission to Business Office	236	100	73	85	56	85	50	83	57	86	125	82	111	88
Keeps detailed records of income and expense	227	96	63	73	51	77	54	90	59	89	125	82	102	81
Maintains daily cash sheets to Business Office with cash receipts and register tapes	193	82	49	57	40	61	43	72	61	42	108	71	85	67
Sends summaries of cash sheets to Business Office with cash receipts and register tapes	158	67	47	55	37	56	36	60	38	58	79	52	79	63
Approves all invoices and sends to Business Office for payment	229	97	66	77	55	83	52	87	56	85	123	81	106	84
Prepares payrolls and sends to Business Office where checks are drawn	190	81	50	58	47	71	43	72	50	76	112	74	78	62
Keeps separate records for various revenue producing depts.	203	86	51	59	44	67	50	83	58	88	112	74	91	72
Prepares monthly, quarterly and semi-annual statements of income and expense for the information of Business Office	107	45	27	31	19	29	23	38	38	58	59	39	48	38
Prepares a report for a full year operation for the record of Business Office	120	51	33	38	23	35	29	48	35	53	66	43	54	43
Regularly reconciles Union Financial operation with Business Office control accounts	191	81	53	62	44	67	42	70	52	79	101	66	90	71
Independent of Business Office	53	22	11	13	8	12	16	27	18	27	33	22	20	16

Section 7

Facilities

Table 129. Union Building Facilities
(Survey Participation Totals)

Total Unions—278

School Enrollment:
Under 2500—86
2500-4999—66
5000-9999—60
Over 10,000—66

Age of Unions:
Before 1962—152
1963-1972—126

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Recreation Facilities:										
Billiard Room	254	91	76	88	63	95	55	92	60	91
Table Tennis	219	79	72	84	56	85	45	75	46	70
Bowling	116	42	15	17	23	35	34	57	44	67
Swimming Pool	9	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
Card Room	132	47	39	45	35	53	31	52	27	41
Ice Skating Rink	4	1	1	—	3	5	—	—	—	—
Table Shuffleboard	36	13	13	15	9	14	6	10	8	12
Floor Shuffleboard	7	3	6	7	—	—	1	2	—	—
Foosball	28	10	7	8	4	6	13	22	4	6
Table Games	9	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	5
Pin Ball Machines	33	12	6	7	9	14	11	18	7	11
Ski Slide	2	—	—	—	1	2	1	2	—	—
Health Club	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
Gymnasium (adequate for volleyball, basketball)	13	5	2	2	4	6	4	7	3	5
Other Exercise Rooms (weight lifting, exercycle, etc.)	13	5	2	2	3	5	3	5	5	8
Rifle Range	5	2	2	2	2	3	—	—	1	2
Boat House, with boats, canoes to rent	14	5	2	2	3	5	5	8	4	6
Ski Shop, with skis to rent	11	4	1	—	3	5	3	5	4	6
Outing Center or Lodge away from Campus	17	6	2	2	3	5	7	12	5	8
Chess Room (separate from Card Room or Snack Bar)	20	7	4	5	7	11	6	10	3	5

Table 129. Continued

Type of Schools:
Urban—154
Rural—61
Suburban—63

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963-1972		Urban		Rural		Suburban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
134	88	120	95	142	92	55	90	57	90
106	70	113	90	124	81	45	74	50	79
78	51	38	30	73	47	23	38	20	32
5	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	5
63	41	69	54	70	45	22	36	40	63
1	—	3	2	1	—	2	3	1	2
20	13	16	13	18	12	10	16	8	13
2	—	5	4	2	1	—	—	5	8
17	11	11	9	18	12	7	11	3	5
3	2	6	5	7	5	2	3	—	—
19	13	14	11	21	14	4	7	8	13
1	—	1	—	1	—	1	2	—	—
1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
4	3	9	7	10	6	2	3	1	2
5	3	8	6	12	8	1	2	—	—
2	1	3	2	4	3	—	—	1	2
9	5	5	4	8	5	5	8	1	2
5	3	6	5	6	4	4	7	1	2
11	7	6	5	7	5	5	8	5	8
9	6	11	9	10	6	3	5	7	11

Table 129. Continued

Facility	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Enrollment: Under 2500 No.	Under 2500 %	2500–4999 No.	2500–4999 %	5000–9999 No.	5000–9999 %	Over 10,000 No.	Over 10,000 %
Social Facilities:										
Ballroom	202	73	47	55	42	64	51	85	62	94
Party Room	78	28	18	21	17	26	18	30	25	38
Lounge	248	89	78	91	54	82	57	95	59	89
Faculty Lounge	82	29	24	28	19	29	18	30	21	32
Coffee House (separate from Snack Bar)	101	36	20	7	21	32	33	55	27	41
Outdoor Terrace or Patio (for lounging, refreshments, outdoor social and music programming, etc.)	172	62	46	53	40	61	35	58	51	77
Lounge or Powder Room for Women only	123	44	26	30	30	45	28	47	39	59
Lounge for Men only	45	16	9	3	14	21	15	25	7	11
Program Lounge (i.e., primarily for scheduled discussions, readings, music and T.V. programs, film talks, etc.)	117	42	33	38	27	41	28	47	29	44
Faculty Lounge *exclusively* for faculty and their guests	44	16	16	19	11	17	8	13	9	14
Faculty Club *exclusively* for faculty and their guests	12	4	2	2	4	6	1	2	5	8
Cultural-Hobby Facilities:										
Music Room (Listening)	[illegible]	[illegible]	41	48	31	47	35	58	46	70
Music Room (Practice)	47	17	12	14	12	18	8	13	15	23
Photo Dark Room	143	51	40	47	31	47	33	55	39	59
Poster Room	141	51	27	31	42	71	35	58	37	56

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963-1972		Urban		Rural		Sub-burban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
118	78	84	67	123	80	35	57	44	70
44	29	34	27	42	27	16	26	20	32
134	88	114	90	134	87	51	84	63	100
52	34	30	24	47	31	18	30	17	27
53	35	48	38	61	40	16	26	24	38
85	56	87	69	92	60	39	64	41	65
71	47	52	41	72	47	24	39	27	43
23	15	22	17	22	14	10	16	13	21
62	41	55	44	52	34	27	44	38	60
22	14	22	17	23	15	9	15	12	19
9	6	3	2	7	5	—	—	5	8
96	63	57	45	80	52	36	59	37	59
30	20	17	13	29	19	5	8	13	21
83	55	60	48	68	57	23	38	32	51
76	50	65	52	81	53	28	46	32	51

Table 129. Continued

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Outing Headquarters	34	12	5	6	12	18	7	12	10	15
Amateur Radio Room	48	17	15	17	11	17	6	10	16	24
Auditorium	67	24	13	15	9	14	14	23	31	47
Theater (with working stage)	53	19	10	12	11	17	13	22	19	29
Craft Shop	42	15	4	5	6	9	9	15	23	35
Television Room	195	70	51	59	45	68	40	67	59	89
Browsing Room	68	24	13	15	12	18	13	22	30	45
Art Exhibition Facilities: (Sum of (a), (b), (c)			(84)		(67)		(74)		(102)	
(a) Separate, Enclosed Gallery	67	24	16	19	13	20	14	23	24	36
(b) Lounge Exhibition Space	110	40	31	36	21	32	23	38	35	53
(c) Corridor-Lobby Exhibition Space	150	54	37	43	33	50	37	62	43	65
Theater Rehearsal Rooms	31	11	6	7	6	9	9	15	10	15
Paperback Book Center—Browsing and Sales (Separate from Bookstore)	26	9	4	5	5	8	5	8	12	18
Meeting Facilities:										
Small Committee Rooms	233	84	67	78	55	92	55	92	56	85
Meeting Rooms	246	88	67	78	59	89	57	95	63	95
Service Facilities:										
Coat Room (unattended)	150	54	43	50	33	50	33	55	41	62
Checkroom (attended)	84	30	13	15	17	26	20	33	33	50
Information Desk	244	88	71	83	61	92	52	87	60	91
Western Union	14	5	1	1	3	5	3	5	7	11
Public (Pay) Phones	264	95	77	90	64	97	57	95	66	100

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963–1972		Urban		Rural		Suburban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
18	12	16	13	17	11	9	15	8	13
27	18	21	17	27	18	10	16	11	17
41	27	26	21	38	25	14	23	15	24
32	21	21	17	29	19	12	20	12	19
25	16	17	13	25	16	5	8	12	19
112	74	83	66	115	75	40	66	40	63
37	24	31	25	43	28	9	15	16	25
(176)		(151)		(182)		(67)		(78)	
32	21	35	28	40	26	14	23	13	21
59	39	51	40	63	41	22	36	25	40
85	56	65	52	79	51	31	51	40	63
17	11	14	11	18	12	4	7	9	14
18	12	8	6	13	8	7	11	6	10
124	82	119	94	126	82	52	85	55	87
132	87	114	90	137	89	49	80	60	95
76	50	74	59	78	51	34	56	38	60
51	34	34	27	43	28	19	31	22	35
131	86	113	90	138	90	52	85	54	86
11	7	3	2	9	6	2	3	3	5
145	95	119	94	142	92	59	97	63	100

Table 129. Continued

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
House Phones	190	68	56	65	45	68	42	70	47	71
Postal Service	128	46	44	51	23	35	22	37	39	59
Individual Mail Boxes	83	30	42	49	19	29	10	17	12	18
Ticket Office	139	50	34	40	34	52	31	52	40	61
Laundry-Dry Cleaning (Pick-up)	19	7	6	7	4	6	4	7	5	8
Barber Shop	87	31	7	8	13	20	31	52	36	55
Beauty Shop	16	6	1	1	3	5	6	10	6	9
Lockers	164	59	44	51	41	62	34	57	45	58
Travel Agency	36	13	10	12	3	5	10	17	13	20
Parking Area	148	53	49	57	31	47	31	52	37	56
Bank										
Space Rental Basis	40	14	11	13	14	21	9	14	6	9
Other Arrangement	4	1	—	—	—	—	2	3	2	3
Coin-operated Laundry Machines										
Space Rental Basis	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Commission Basis	2	—	1	1	—	—	1	2	—	—
Charge For Use	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nursery or Child Day Care Room	9	3	—	—	5	8	2	3	2	3
Typing Room	22	8	6	7	5	8	6	10	5	8
Post Office Government Sub-Station	61	22	15	17	13	20	10	17	23	35
Post Office Government Contract Station	26	9	6	7	1	2	4	7	15	23
Print Shop for Job Printing	55	20	10	12	14	21	16	27	15	23
Food Facilities:										
Cafeteria	205	74	52	60	44	67	50	83	59	89
Snack Bar	243	87	73	85	59	89	51	85	60	91
Restaurant (waiter service)	60	22	6	7	10	15	13	22	31	47
Coffee Shop	32	12	4	5	6	9	14	23	8	12
Private Dining Rooms	136	49	37	43	29	44	29	48	41	62

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963-1972		Urban		Rural		Sub-burban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
106	70	84	67	107	69	41	67	42	67
74	49	54	43	71	46	31	51	26	41
41	27	42	33	41	27	22	36	20	32
74	49	65	52	77	50	25	41	37	59
13	8	6	5	4	3	8	13	7	11
60	39	27	21	55	36	14	23	18	29
13	8	3	2	11	7	2	3	3	5
87	57	77	61	90	58	39	64	35	56
17	11	19	14	17	11	9	15	10	16
78	51	70	56	86	56	31	51	31	49
19	12	21	17	23	15	6	10	11	17
3	2	1	—	3	2	1	2	—	—
1	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	—
1	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	2
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
3	2	6	5	5	3	—	—	4	6
11	7	11	9	11	7	2	3	9	14
34	22	27	21	39	25	11	18	11	17
20	13	6	5	18	12	2	3	6	10
27	18	28	22	27	18	12	20	16	25
121	79	84	67	115	75	36	59	54	86
129	84	114	90	131	85	51	84	61	97
42	27	18	14	34	22	15	25	12	19
26	17	6	5	14	9	8	13	10	16
82	53	54	43	77	50	29	48	39	48

Table 129. Continued

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Vending Machine Room	136	49	42	49	35	53	22	37	37	56
Banqueting	210	76	54	63	48	73	48	80	60	91
Kitchenette (self-service)	36	13	12	14	7	11	5	8	12	18
Tavern	5	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Commuter Facilities:										
Lockers	101	36	30	35	25	38	22	37	24	36
Lounge	71	26	19	22	21	32	15	25	16	24
Study Room	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—
Dining Room	26	9	5	6	6	9	7	12	8	12
Cot Room	29	10	8	9	6	10	7	12	8	12
Dressing Room	21	8	4	5	7	11	5	8	5	8
Office Space	18	6	4	5	5	8	4	7	5	8
Organization-Facilities; Administrative Offices:										
General Work Room	125	45	29	34	30	45	34	57	32	48
Filing Facilities	157	56	46	53	41	62	34	56	36	54
Desk Facilities	139	50	40	46	36	54	29	48	34	51
Mail Boxes for Organizations	186	67	43	50	45	68	51	85	47	71
Storage Lockers for Organizations	112	40	26	30	26	39	31	52	29	44
Campus Radio Station	80	29	23	27	22	33	15	25	20	30
Campus Newspaper Office	185	67	63	76	52	79	40	67	30	45
Year Book Office	167	60	55	64	46	70	32	53	34	52
Union-Board-Committee Office	185	67	53	62	49	74	40	67	43	65
Student Government Office	216	78	59	69	55	83	48	80	54	82
I.F.C. Office	61	22	4	5	11	17	17	28	29	44
Panhellenic Office	49	18	1	1	6	10	13	22	29	44
Alumni Office	42	15	4	5	8	12	9	15	21	32
Alumni Lounge	26	9	7	8	5	8	5	8	9	14

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963–1972		Urban		Rural		Sub-burban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
70	45	66	52	76	49	22	36	38	50
118	78	92	73	118	77	40	66	52	83
21	14	15	12	18	12	7	11	11	17
2	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	3
48	31	53	42	58	38	25	41	18	29
36	23	35	28	43	28	13	21	15	24
1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
18	12	8	6	19	12	2	3	5	8
13	9	16	13	19	12	2	3	8	13
7	5	14	11	15	10	2	3	4	6
13	9	5	4	8	5	2	3	8	13
58	38	67	53	75	49	20	33	30	48
76	50	81	64	67	43	37	60	53	84
54	35	85	67	56	36	35	57	48	76
103	67	83	66	102	66	37	61	47	75
60	39	52	41	62	43	23	38	27	32
40	26	40	32	42	27	15	25	23	37
94	61	91	72	100	65	36	59	49	78
81	53	86	68	98	64	32	52	37	59
96	62	89	71	103	67	37	61	45	71
119	78	97	77	119	77	45	74	52	83
40	26	21	17	35	23	13	21	13	21
37	24	12	10	32	21	10	16	6	10
30	19	12	10	29	19	6	10	7	11
16	10	10	8	16	10	6	10	4	6

Table 129. Continued

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Religious Counselor Office	52	19	17	20	13	20	14	23	8	12
Draft Counselor Office	3	1	—	—	1	2	1	2	1	2
Counselor Offices	5	2	2	2	—	—	1	2	2	3
Loan Fund Office	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
AWS Office	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
Union Staff Administrative and Program Office	246	88	72	84	61	92	55	92	58	88
Placement Office	3	1	1	1	2	3	—	—	—	—
Ombudsman Office	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
Credit Union Office	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—
Chapel	22	8	9	10	5	8	3	5	5	8
Meditation Room	14	5	4	5	3	5	6	10	1	2
Registration Room	12	4	3	3	2	3	1	2	7	11
Student Council or Senate Chamber (special room designed for open Senate meetings)	127	46	40	47	32	48	31	52	24	36
Office (only) for International Club	35	13	5	6	6	10	14	23	10	15
International Center (i.e., some combination of club rooms, information service office for advisor to overseas students)	24	9	1	1	5	8	12	20	6	9
Office for minority organizations (i.e., black students)	90	32	17	20	19	29	26	43	28	42
Club Rooms primarily for use of minority student groups	15	5	2	2	3	5	5	8	5	8

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963–1972		Urban		Rural		Sub-burban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
30	19	22	17	31	20	13	21	8	13
2	1	1	—	1	—	1	2	1	2
3	2	2	2	4	3	—	—	1	2
1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
129	85	117	93	133	86	54	86	59	94
2	1	1	—	2	1	—	—	1	2
—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
14	9	8	6	13	8	7	11	2	3
8	5	6	5	7	5	3	5	4	6
8	5	4	3	6	4	4	7	2	3
56	37	71	56	58	38	29	48	40	63
22	14	13	10	18	12	7	11	10	16
19	13	5	4	15	10	2	3	7	11
55	36	35	28	51	33	14	23	25	40
7	5	8	6	7	5	3	5	5	8

Table 129. Continued

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fraternity, Sorority Chapter Rooms or Lounges (Exclusive use)	13	5	2	2	1	2	6	10	4	6
YMCA Office	9	3	—	—	3	5	—	—	6	9
YWCA Office	4	1	—	—	1	2	—	—	3	5
Communications Center (lobby area for student display, tables, sales, petitions)	185	67	48	56	47	71	45	75	45	68
Interview Rooms (committee recruiting interviews, job interviews, etc.)	97	35	32	37	23	35	23	38	19	29
Wall cases for Promotional Displays, Trophies, etc.	166	60	41	48	37	56	43	72	45	68
Stores and Other Facilities:										
Bookstore	208	75	67	78	53	80	45	75	43	65
School Supplies only (no texts or trade books)	12	4	2	2	2	3	5	8	3	5
Guest Rooms	45	16	12	14	6	9	8	13	19	29
Clothing Store (separate from Bookstore)	13	5	5	6	3	5	2	3	3	5
Flower Shop	2	—	—	—	1	2	1	2	—	—
Gift Shop (separate from Bookstore)	18	6	4	5	1	2	4	7	9	14
Central Mailing, duplicating room (mimeograph, offset, addressing, postage metering machines, etc.)	68	24	16	19	20	30	14	23	18	27
Rooms for Study Primarily	62	22	16	19	18	27	13	22	15	23

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963-1972		Urban		Rural		Sub-burban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6	4	7	5	9	6	1	2	3	5
8	5	1	—	7	5	1	2	1	2
4	3	—	—	3	2	—	—	1	2
103	68	82	65	96	62	37	61	52	83
57	38	40	32	46	30	26	43	25	40
90	59	76	60	92	60	34	56	40	53
101	66	107	85	115	75	42	69	51	81
11	7	1	—	6	4	3	5	3	5
25	16	20	16	25	17	12	20	8	13
7	5	6	5	5	3	3	5	5	8
—	—	2	2	2	1	—	—	—	—
13	9	5	4	10	6	4	7	4	6
30	20	38	30	38	25	12	20	18	29
35	23	27	21	30	19	12	20	30	48

Table 129. Continued

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Adult Conference or Adult Education Facilities:										
(Primarily for adult conference use)										
Lobby-Lounge (separate from Main Union lounge)	25	9	6	7	1	2	9	15	9	14
Registration-Reception Area	55	20	14	16	7	11	15	25	19	29
Information Desk (separate from Main Union desk)	27	10	9	10	2	3	12	20	4	6
Checkroom (separate from Main Union checkroom)	19	7	2	2	2	3	9	15	6	9
Small Conference Rooms	86	31	24	28	13	20	24	40	25	38
Larger Meeting and Seminar Rooms	76	27	18	21	14	21	20	33	24	36
Private Dining Rooms	51	18	11	13	7	11	15	25	18	27
Conference Auditorium (separate from general Union auditorium or ballroom)	9	3	1	1	2	3	3	5	3	5
Conference Administration Offices	22	8	4	5	4	6	7	12	7	11

Table 129. Continued

Age of Union				Type of School					
Before 1962		1963-1972		Urban		Rural		Sub-burban	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
15	10	10	8	16	10	4	7	5	8
31	20	24	19	33	21	12	20	10	16
13	9	14	11	14	9	8	13	5	8
11	7	8	6	9	6	5	8	5	8
44	29	42	33	41	27	26	43	19	30
39	26	37	29	37	24	20	33	19	30
28	18	23	18	26	17	12	20	13	21
5	3	4	3	5	3	2	3	2	3
14	9	8	6	12	8	5	8	5	8

Table 130. Billiards Facilities
(254 Institutions Responding; 91% of total)

No. of Tables	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	26	10	18	23	5	8	3	6	—	—
3-6	102	40	52	67	31	50	15	28	4	6
7-10	54	22	7	9	18	29	14	26	15	25
11-15	34	13	1	1	7	11	13	25	13	21
16-20	24	9	—	—	1	2	5	9	18	30
Over 20	14	6	—	—	—	—	3	6	11	18
TOTALS	254		78		62		53		61	

Table 131. Billiards Use Charge
(254 Institutions Responding; 91% of total)

Charge Per Hour	Total Unions	
	No.	%
No Charge	23	9
5-10¢	1	—
11-25¢	11	4
26-40¢	8	3
41-60¢	54	21
61-75¢	37	15
76-90¢	29	11
91-$1.00	51	20
Over $1.00	40	16
TOTALS	254	

Table 132. Table Tennis Facilities
(219 Institutions Responding; 79% of total)

No. of Tables	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	104	48	48	66	25	45	23	51	8	17
3-6	101	46	23	32	28	51	20	45	30	66
7-10	13	6	2	2	2	4	2	4	7	15
11-15	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
TOTALS	219		73		55		45		46	

Table 133. Table Tennis Use Charge
(210 Institutions Responding; 76% of total)

Charge Per Hour	Total Unions
No Charge	103
Charge (No Time Limit)	
5-10¢	11
11-25¢	6
Charge (Per Hour)	
5-10¢	8
11-25¢	17
26-40¢	24
41-60¢	37
61-$1.00	4
TOTALS	210

Table 134. Bowling Facilities
(116 Institutions Responding; 42% of total)

			Enrollment							
No. of	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Ten Pin Lanes	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4-6	36	31	12	80	13	59	11	33	—	—
7-10	39	34	3	20	8	36	13	39	15	33
11-15	17	15	—	—	1	5	6	19	10	22
16-25	24	20	—	—	—	—	3	9	21	45
TOTALS	116		15		22		33		46	

Table 135. Bowling—Pinsetting Equipment
(116 Institutions Responding; 42% of total)

			Age of Unions			
Type of	Total Unions		Before 1962		1963-1972	
Equipment	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Automatic	115	99	75	99	40	100
Semi-Automatic	1	1	1	1	—	—
Manual	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	116		76		40	

Table 136. Bowling—Ownership of Pinsetting Equipment
(116 Institutions Responding; 42% of total)

Ownership of Equipment	Total Unions		Age of Unions			
			Before 1962		1963-72	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Owned	94	81	60	81	34	81
Leased	22	19	14	19	8	19
TOTALS	116		74		42	

Table 137. Bowling—Charges Per Line
(109 Institutions Responding; 93% of Unions having bowling)

Kind of Bowling	Total Unions	Charge Per Line						
		20¢	25¢	30¢	35¢	40¢	45¢	50¢
Open	100	—	4	4	16	37	20	19
League	84	1	1	5	27	26	13	11
Physical Education	24	2	5	4	7	4	1	1
Outside Groups	48	—	2	1	10	14	8	13

Table 138. Bowling—Charge Per Hour
(9 Institutions Responding; 7% of Unions having bowling)

Kind of Bowling	Total Unions	Charge Per Lane Per Hour				
		$1-1.99	$2-2.99	$3.00	$6.00	$10.00 and over
Open	2	1	1	—	—	—
League	3	3	—	—	—	—
Physical Education	7	5	—	1	1	—
Outside Groups	1	—	—	—	—	1

Table 139. Bowling—Charge Per Term
(49 Institutions Responding; 42% of Unions having bowling)

		Charge Per Student Per Term				
Kind of Bowling	Total Unions	$5.00	$6.00-10.00	$11.00-13.00	$14.00-15.00	$16.00 and over
Open	—	—	—	—	—	—
League	—	—	—	—	—	—
Physical Education	49	5	35	3	6	—
Outside Groups	1	—	—	—	1	—

Table 140. Card Room Facilities
(132 Institutions Responding; 47% of total)

			Enrollment							
No. of Tables	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	16	12	5	13	3	10	6	17	2	8
3-5	32	24	12	30	9	29	7	20	5	19
6-8	39	31	10	25	9	29	11	31	9	35
9-12	28	21	9	22	6	19	8	23	5	19
Over 12	16	12	4	10	4	13	3	9	5	19
TOTALS	132		40		31		35		26	

Table 141. Ballroom Facilities
(202 Institutions Responding; 73% of total)

			Enrollment							
No. of Ballrooms	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	164	82	43	94	47	96	37	84	37	59
2	27	13	2	4	2	4	4	9	19	30
3	6	3	—	—	—	—	2	5	4	6
4	5	2	1	2	—	—	1	2	3	5
TOTALS	202		46		49		44		63	

Table 142. Ballroom—Typical Usage
(202 Institutions Responding; 73% of total)

Usage	Total Unions	
	No.	%
Exhibits	130	64
Conferences	169	84
Receptions	160	74
Movies	155	77
Banqueting	162	80
Fashion Shows	143	71
Meetings	183	91
Lectures	177	88
Rehearsals—Band	2	—
Rehearsals—Drama	2	—
Graduation	1	—
Lounge	3	1
*Dances	45	22
Demonstrations (Fencing, Judo, Karate)	3	1
Concerts	15	7
Registration	4	2
Examinations	2	—
Roller Skating	1	—
Blood Drive	4	2

*Write-in responses. Item not included in questionnaire as ballroom is commonly used for dances.

Table 143. Lounge Facilities
(248 Institutions Responding; 89% of total)

No. of Lounges	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	81	33	38	51	22	36	10	19	11	19
2	71	28	21	29	20	32	17	31	13	22
3	39	16	10	14	8	13	12	22	9	16
4	27	11	3	4	4	6	7	13	13	22
5	15	6	1	1	3	5	5	9	6	10
6	9	4	—	—	2	3	2	4	5	9
Over 6	6	2	1	1	3	5	1	2	1	2
TOTALS	248		74		62		54		58	

Table 144. Faculty Lounge Facilities*
(82 Institutions Responding; 29% of total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
No. of Lounges	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	74	94	23	96	19	90	17	100	18	90
2	2	2	1	4	1	5	—	—	—	—
3	3	4	—	—	1	5	—	—	2	10
TOTALS	82		24		21		17		20	

*Not necessarily used exclusively by faculty.

Table 145. Music Listening Rooms—Lounges
(153 Institutions Responding; 55% of total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
No. of Lounges	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	116	76	30	85	24	75	29	83	33	65
2	26	16	1	3	8	25	4	11	13	25
3	7	5	2	6	—	—	2	6	3	6
4	4	3	2	6	—	—	—	—	2	4
TOTALS	153		35		32		35		51	

Table 146. Music Listening Rooms—Booths
(40 Institutions Responding; 14% of total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
No. of Booths	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	3	7	2	29	—	—	1	13	—	—
2	5	13	1	14	—	—	1	13	3	17
3	6	15	1	14	1	14	1	13	3	17
4	12	30	3	43	1	14	2	24	6	33
5	4	10	—	—	1	14	1	13	2	11
6	10	25	—	—	4	58	2	24	4	22
TOTALS	40		7		7		8		18	

Table 147. Music Practice Rooms
(47 Institutions Responding; 17% of total)

No. of Rooms	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
1	19	40
2	6	13
3	13	28
4	5	11
Over 4	4	8
TOTALS	47	

Table 148. ***Auditorium*** *Facilities—Seating Capacity*
(67 Institutions Responding; 24% of total)

Seating Capacity	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 250	11	16	2	15	1	20	4	25	4	12
250-500	33	50	6	47	1	20	7	44	19	58
501-750	10	15	2	15	—	—	1	6	7	21
751-1000	6	9	2	15	1	20	2	13	1	3
1001-1500	5	7	1	8	2	40	1	6	1	3
Over 1500	2	3	—	—	—	—	1	6	1	3
TOTALS	67		13		5		16		33	

Table 149. ***Theater*** *Facilities (Working Stage)—Seating Capacity*
(53 Institutions Responding; 19% of total)

Seating Capacity	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 250	12	22	2	17	3	27	3	21	4	25
250-500	29	55	9	75	5	46	7	50	8	50
501-1000	8	15	—	—	3	27	3	21	2	13
1001-1500	2	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	12
Over 1500	2	4	1	8	—	—	1	8	—	—
TOTALS	53		12		11		14		16	

Table 150. Small Committee Room Facilities
(233 Institutions Responding; 84% of total)

No. of Rooms	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	46	20	22	32	7	13	11	20	6	11
2–4	121	52	38	55	36	68	27	48	20	36
5–6	37	15	7	11	8	15	7	13	15	27
7–10	16	7	1	1	1	2	6	11	8	15
Over 10	13	6	1	1	1	2	5	8	6	11
TOTALS	233		69		53		56		55	

Table 151. Meeting Room Facilities
(246 Institutions Responding; 88% of total)

No. of Rooms	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	32	13	15	23	6	10	6	11	5	8
2–4	84	34	36	55	25	43	18	32	5	8
5–6	34	14	10	15	12	20	6	11	6	9
7–10	44	18	3	5	14	24	14	24	13	20
Over 10	52	21	1	2	2	3	13	22	36	55
TOTALS	246		65		59		57		65	

*Table 152. Coat Room Facilities (**Unattended**)*
(150 Institutions Responding; 54% of total)

No. of Rooms	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–2	124	82	40	83	26	87	25	83	33	79
3	16	11	5	10	3	10	3	10	5	12
4	6	4	2	4	1	3	—	—	3	7
5	4	3	1	3	—	—	2	7	1	2
TOTALS	150		48		30		30		42	

*Table 153. Check Room Facilities (**Attended**)*
(84 Institutions Responding; 30% of Total)

No. of Rooms	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	77	92	13	100	14	100	19	90	31	86
2	7	8	—	—	—	—	2	10	5	14
3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	84		13		14		21		36	

Table 154. Information Desk
(244 Institutions Responding; 88% of total)

Location and Contents	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Directly related to administrative offices	175	71	66	92	47	77	41	61	21	34
Remote from offices	91	37	8	11	21	34	19	31	43	70
Includes newspapers, cigarettes, candy, etc.	112	46	20	27	24	38	27	46	41	61

*Table 155. Public Telephone Facilities (**Pay**)*
(264 Institutions Responding; 95% of total)

No. of Telephones	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	77	29	46	61	18	28	7	12	6	9
3-4	63	24	16	21	17	27	23	40	7	10
5-6	52	20	9	12	15	23	14	25	14	21
7-8	22	8	2	3	7	11	6	11	7	10
Over 8	50	19	2	3	7	11	7	12	34	50
TOTALS	264		75		64		57		68	

Table 156. House Telephone Facilities
(190 Institutions Responding; 68% of total)

No. of Telephones	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	130	68	39	76	37	79	30	74	24	47
3-4	46	24	10	20	9	19	8	20	19	37
5-6	5	3	1	2	—	—	1	2	3	6
7-8	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	—	—
Over 8	6	3	—	—	—	—	1	2	5	10
TOTALS	190		51		47		41		51	

Table 157. Barber Shop Facilities
(87 Institutions Responding; 31% of total)

No. of Chairs	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	23	26	6	75	7	50	8	27	2	6
3-4	35	40	1	13	5	36	19	64	10	29
5-6	17	20	—	—	1	7	1	3	15	43
7-8	8	9	1	12	1	7	1	3	5	14
9-10	4	5	—	—	—	—	1	3	3	8
TOTALS	87		8		14		30		35	

Table 158. Lockers—Coin Operated
(93 Institutions Responding; 33% of total)

No. of Lockers	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-25	22	23	10	59	5	21	3	14	4	13
26-50	20	22	3	17	7	29	7	32	3	10
51-100	20	22	2	12	4	17	6	27	8	27
101-150	6	6	—	—	1	4	1	5	4	13
151-200	9	10	1	6	4	17	1	5	3	10
Over 200	16	17	1	6	3	12	4	17	8	27
TOTALS	93		17		24		22		30	

*Table 159. Lockers—**Rental***
(71 Institutions Responding; 26% of total)

No. of Lockers	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-25	7	10	1	6	3	17	1	8	2	8
26-50	11	15	6	35	4	22	—	—	1	4
51-100	15	21	5	29	3	17	3	25	4	17
101-150	6	9	—	—	1	6	2	17	3	13
151-200	12	17	1	6	3	17	3	25	5	21
Over 200	20	28	4	24	4	21	3	25	9	37
TOTALS	71		17		18		12		24	

*Table 160. Parking Area—**Staff***
(103 Institutions Responding; 37% of total)

No. of Cars Accommodated	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-10	33	32	15	43	10	52	6	23	2	9
11-20	15	15	3	9	3	16	7	27	2	9
21-30	8	8	5	14	—	—	1	4	2	9
31-50	15	15	5	14	3	16	3	12	4	17
Over 50	32	30	7	20	3	16	9	34	13	56
TOTALS	103		35		19		26		23	

*Table 161. Parking Area—**Public***
(101 Institutions Responding; 36% of total)

No. of Cars Accommodated	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-20	12	12	6	19	1	5	2	11	3	10
21-50	11	11	8	25	1	5	—	—	2	6
51-75	6	6	2	6	1	5	1	5	2	6
76-100	11	11	3	9	4	21	1	5	3	10
101-150	11	11	4	13	2	11	1	5	4	13
Over 150	50	49	9	28	10	53	14	74	17	55
TOTALS	101		32		19		19		31	

*Table 162. Food Facilities—**Cafeteria***
(205 Institutions Responding; 74% of total)

Seating Capacity	Total Unions		Enrollment Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 100	1	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
100–200	21	10	8	15	3	7	3	6	7	11
201–300	35	18	10	19	7	16	12	26	6	10
301–400	42	20	11	20	9	21	11	23	11	18
401–500	29	14	5	9	5	12	10	21	9	15
501–750	47	23	13	25	12	28	4	9	18	29
751–1000	20	10	3	6	6	14	4	9	7	11
Over 1000	10	5	2	4	1	2	3	6	4	6
TOTALS	205		53		43		47		62	
Also serves residence hall students	49	18	17	20	12	18	16	27	4	6

*Table 163. Food Facility—**Snack Bar***
(222 Institutions Responding; 80% of total)

Seating Capacity	Total Unions		Enrollment Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 100	33	15	15	23	7	13	5	11	6	10
100–200	73	33	39	59	18	34	11	24	5	8
201–300	42	19	10	15	16	31	5	11	11	19
301–400	28	13	2	3	6	12	10	22	10	17
401–500	24	11	—	—	3	6	9	21	12	20
Over 500	22	10	—	—	2	4	5	11	15	26
TOTALS	222		66		52		45		59	

Table 164. Food Facility—Restaurant-type ***Waiter Service*** *Dining Room*
(60 Institutions Responding; 22% of total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Seating Capacity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 50	4	7	2	29	1	10	1	8	—	—
51-75	11	18	3	42	4	40	3	25	1	3
76-100	14	23	2	29	3	30	1	8	8	26
101-150	13	22	—	—	—	—	4	34	9	29
151-200	7	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	23
Over 200	11	18	—	—	2	20	3	25	6	19
TOTALS	60		7		10		12		31	

*Table 165. Food Facility—**Coffee Shop***
(32 Institutions Responding; 12% of total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Seating Capacity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 50	2	6	1	20	—	—	1	8	—	—
51-75	3	9	1	20	1	17	—	—	1	11
76-100	5	16	—	—	1	17	4	34	—	—
101-150	13	41	3	60	3	50	5	42	2	22
151-200	2	6	—	—	1	16	1	8	—	—
Over 200	7	22	—	—	—	—	1	8	6	67
TOTALS	32		5		6		12		9	

*Table 166. Food Facility—**Private Dining Room***
(136 Institutions Responding; 49% of total)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
No. of Rooms	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	78	57	28	78	19	66	19	66	12	29
3-4	24	18	8	22	5	17	4	14	7	17
5	6	4	—	—	2	7	1	3	3	7
Over 5	28	21	—	—	3	10	5	17	20	47
TOTALS	136		36		29		29		42	

*Table 167. Food Facility—Vending Machine **Room***
(59 Institutions Responding; 21% of total)*

Seating Capacity	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
10–25	12	20	7	35	2	18	—	—	3	19
26–50	14	24	1	5	4	33	5	45	4	25
51–100	10	17	3	15	4	33	—	—	3	19
100–150	10	17	6	30	1	8	2	18	1	6
Over 150	13	22	3	15	1	8	4	37	5	31
TOTALS	59		20		12		11		16	

*Several did not indicate seating capacity.

*Table 168. Vending **Machines***
(120 Institutions Responding; 43% of total)

No. of Machines	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–2	11	9	1	3	5	15	1	5	4	15
3–4	16	13	9	24	5	15	2	9	—	—
5–6	33	28	14	36	7	22	6	27	6	22
7–8	26	22	11	29	9	27	3	14	3	11
9–10	11	9	1	3	4	12	3	14	3	11
Over 10	23	19	2	5	3	9	7	31	11	41
TOTALS	120		38		33		22		27	

*Table 169. Commuter **Locker** Facilities*
(83 Institutions Responding; 29% of total)

No. of Lockers	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–25	16	19	7	22	1	5	4	21	4	20
26–50	19	23	8	35	6	27	—	—	5	25
51–100	12	14	5	23	2	10	4	21	1	5
101–200	19	23	1	5	6	27	6	32	6	30
Over 200	17	21	1	5	7	22	5	26	4	20
TOTALS	83		22		22		19		20	

Table 170. Commuter Cot Room Facilities
(25 Institutions Responding; 9% of total)

No. of Cots	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	4	16	2	25	1	20	1	17	—	—
3-4	11	44	4	50	2	40	4	66	1	17
5-6	5	20	1	13	1	20	—	—	3	50
7-10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over 10	5	20	1	12	1	20	1	17	2	33
TOTALS	25		8		5		6		6	

Table 171. Offices for Union Board and Union Committees
(156 Institutions Responding; 56% of total)

No. of Organizations	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	103	66	33	75	25	60	20	59	25	69
2	14	9	—	—	2	5	7	20	5	14
3	14	9	2	5	7	16	1	3	4	11
Over 3	25	16	9	20	8	19	6	18	2	6
TOTALS	156		44		42		34		36	

Table 172. Filing Facilities in General Work Room for Student Organizations
(157 Institutions Responding; 56% of total)

No. of Organizations	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-5	41	26	26	57	8	20	2	6	5	14
6-10	30	19	8	17	12	28	5	15	5	14
11-15	13	8	2	4	5	12	2	6	4	12
16-25	20	13	6	13	6	15	2	6	6	16
26-50	28	18	4	9	6	15	11	32	7	19
Over 50	25	16	—	—	4	10	12	35	9	25
TOTALS	157		46		41		34		36	

*Table 173. **Desk** Facilities in General Work Room For Student Organizations*
(139 Institutions Responding; 50% of total)

No. of Desks	Total Unions		Enrollment Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	19	14	6	15	5	14	5	17	3	9
3-4	30	21	13	32	9	25	9	24	1	3
5-6	19	14	6	15	8	22	1	3	4	11
7-8	6	4	3	8	1	3	—	—	2	6
Over 8	65	47	12	30	13	36	16	56	24	71
TOTALS	139		40		36		29		34	

Table 174. Religious Counselor Office
(49 Institutions Responding, 18% of total)

No. of Offices	Total Unions		Enrollment Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	35	72	10	63	9	75	10	77	6	75
2	3	6	1	6	—	—	—	—	2	25
3	6	12	4	25	1	8	1	8	—	—
Over 3	5	10	1	6	2	17	2	15	—	—
TOTALS	49		16		12		13		8	

Table 175. Bookstore Facility
(134 Institutions Responding; 48% of total)

Size in Square Feet*	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 1500	11	8	4	10	5	13	1	4	1	3
1501-2500	21	16	9	24	6	15	3	12	3	10
2501-5000	33	24	16	42	13	32	2	8	2	7
5001-7500	24	18	9	24	5	13	7	26	3	10
7501-10,000	9	7	—	—	4	10	2	8	3	10
Over 10,000	36	27	—	—	7	17	11	42	18	60
TOTALS	134		38		40		26		30	

*Data does not indicate whether gross square feet or net assignable square feet.

Table 176. Union Supervisory Staff Members and Counselors (full time and part time) Accomodated in Offices
(246 Institutions Responding; 88% of total)

No. of Staff Members	Total Unions		Enrollment: Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	33	14	22	30	4	7	6	11	1	2
2	47	19	23	31	18	30	3	5	3	5
3	38	15	15	21	12	20	10	18	1	2
4	32	13	6	8	13	21	8	14	5	9
5-6	42	17	5	7	10	17	13	23	14	25
7-8	17	7	2	3	3	5	5	9	7	12
9-10	11	4	—	—	—	—	4	7	7	12
Over 10	26	11	—	—	—	—	7	13	19	33
TOTALS	246		73		60		56		57	

Section 8

Two-Year Colleges

Table TW1. Building Status
(32 Institutions Responding)

Building Status	No. of Schools	% of Schools
Operating Original Building Only	23	72
Have One Addition	6	19
Have Two Additions	1	3
Have Replaced Original Building	2	6
Original Building & Satellite	—	—
TOTALS	32	

Table TW2. Size of Total Physical Plant, By Enrollment
(27 Institutions Responding)

Gross Square Footage	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 30,000	14	52	9	60	4	40	1	50	—	—
30,000-49,999	7	26	5	33	1	10	1	50	—	—
50,000-74,999	2	7	—	—	2	20	—	—	—	—
75,000-99,999	2	7	—	—	2	20	—	—	—	—
100,000-124,999	1	4	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—
125,000-150,000	1	4	—	—	1	10	—	—	—	—
Over 150,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	27		15		10		2		—	

*Table TW3 Original Construction Costs of Total Physical Plant Including Additions**
(23 Institutions Responding)

Construction Cost	Total Unions	% of Unions
Under $250,000	4	17
$250,000-499,999	2	9
$500,000-749,999	6	26
$750,000-999,999	2	9
$1,000,000-1,249,999	1	4
$1,250,000-1,499,999	2	9
$1,500,000-1,999,999	—	—
Over $2,000,000	6	26
TOTALS	23	

*Costs are costs of construction, ranging over 32 years. These costs are typically for construcion only, exclusive of furnishings, equipment, and fees.

Table TW4. Square Foot Construction Costs of Original Building Only
(21 Institutions Responding)

Cost	Unions	
	Number	Per Cent
Under $10.00	—	—
$10-11.99	3	14
$12-13.99	—	—
$14-15.99	2	10
$16-17.99	—	—
$18-19.99	1	4.7
$20-21.99	3	14
$22-23.99	1	4.7
$24-25.99	1	4.7
$26-27.99	2	10
$28-29.99	2	10
Over $30	6	29
TOTALS	21	

Table TW5. Financing of ***Original*** *Building Construction, By Source of Funds and Percentage*
(22 Institutions Responding)

Source	Total Unions Using Source		% of Cost Financed by Source Indicated						
	No.	%	0–15%	16–30%	31–45%	46–60%	61–75%	76–90%	91–100%
Union Fee Accumulations	1	5	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
City, County or State Appropriations	14	64	—	2	—	1	1	—	10
Large Gift	1	5	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
General Subscription	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
College Funds	5	23	—	—	—	1	1	—	3
Federal Funds—War Surplus or WPA Grants	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
HUD or HHFA	3	14	—	—	1	—	—	1	1
Revenue Bonds	4	18	—	—	—	—	—	1	3
Bank, Mortgage or Other Private Loan	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
State Loan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Union Operation	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surpluses From Operation of Other College Enterprises	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sale of Old Union Building	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table TW6. Use of Consultants on All Construction, by Original Building Additions, and Replacement Building
(16 Institutions Responding; 48% of Total Response)

Consultant	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Original Building	1st Addition	2nd Addition	Replacement Building
			11	4	—	1
Building	11	69	9	3	—	—
Bookstore	10	63	7	2	—	1
Interiors	12	75	8	3	—	1
Other:						
Food Service	3	19	3	—	—	—
Theatre, Sound, Lighting	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bowling	—	—	—	—	—	—
Swimming Pool	—	—	—	—	—	—

*Table TW7. Expansion Plans by Gross Area Estimate and by Cost Estimate**
(10 Institutions Responding)

Square Feet	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %	Construction Cost	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Under 25,000	5	50	Under $250,000	1	10
25,000-49,999	3	30	$250,000-749,999	3	30
50,000-74,999	1	10	$750,000-999,999	—	—
75,000-99,999	—	—	$1,000,000-1,499,999	2	20
Over 100,000	—	—	$1,500,000-1,999,999	1	10
Unknown	1	10	Over $2,000,000	2	20
			Unknown	1	10
TOTALS	10		TOTALS	10	

*6 other schools indicated plans for expansion, but gave no figures.

Table TW8. Chronological Development of Union Buildings (2 year institutions)
(33 Institutions Responding)

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
1936–1945	Spokane Falls Comm. College (Wash.)	1939	1967				
1958–1962	Pennsylvania State Univ.-Capital Campus	1958					1967
	Vincennes Univ. (Indiana)	1959	1967				
	Miami Dade Jr. College-North Campus (Florida)	1960	1962	1968	(building age is 1945, but opened as union 1960)		
	Foothill College (California)	1961					
	Mohawk Valley Comm. College (NY)	1961	1971				
	North Idaho College	1961	1962	1963			
1963–1968	Paris Jr. College (Texas)	1964					
	Rockland Comm. College (NY)	1964	1972				
	Casper College (Wyoming)	1965					1969
	Fulton-Montgomery Comm. College (NY)	1965					
	Grossmont College (California)	1965	1971				
	Jefferson College (Missouri)	1965					
	Shoreline Comm. College (Washington)	1965	1972				
	Cuyohoga Comm. College (Ohio)	1966	(building age is 1940, but opened as union 1966)				
	Lorain County Comm. College (Ohio)	1966					
	Parkland College (Illinois)	1967					
	Robert Morris College (Illinois)	1967					
	Agri. & Tech. College at Alfred (NY)	1968					

Table TW8. Continued

Time Period	Institution	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	3rd Add.	Further Add.	Replacement Building
	SUNY-Canton	1968					
1969-1973	Bellevue Comm. College (Washington)	1969	1972				
	Comm. College of Alleghany Co.-South Campus (Penn.)	1969 (rented)					
	William Rainey Harper College (Ill.)	1969					
	College of South Idaho	1970					
	Highland Comm. College (Illinois)	1970					
	Mt. Hood Comm. College (Oregon)	1970					
	Mountain View College (Texas)	1970					
	South Georgia College	1970					
	Green River Comm. College (Washington)	1971					
	Pennsylvania State Univ.-Beaver	1971					
	Jefferson State Jr. College (Alabama)	1972					
	Middlesex County College (NJ)	1972					
	Linn-Benton Comm. College (Oregon)	1973					

Table TW9. Gross Physical Plant Area of Union Buildings, in Square Feet
(2 year institutions)
(25 Institutions Responding)

Institution	1970 Undergrad. Enroll-ment	1970 Total Enroll-ment	Total Present Area	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	Replace-ment Building
Up to 30,000 Square Feet							
1. Parkland College (Illinois)	3,296	3,296	3,828	3,828	(rented building)		
2. Comm. College of Alleghany Co.—South Campus (Penn.)	—	—	4,500	4,500	(rented building)		
3. Robert Morris College (Illinois)	574	574	9,879	9,879			
4. Highland Comm. College (Illinois)	1,000	1,000	13,000	13,000			
5. North Idaho College	974	974	14,440	5,785	716	7,979	
6. Penn. State Univ.—Beaver Campus	937	937	14,955	14,955			
7. College of Southern Idaho	1,200	1,200	18,019	18,019			
8. Spokane Falls Comm. College (Wash.)	3,563	3,563	19,600	19,200	400		
9. Bellevue Comm. College (Wash.)	2,821	2,821	19,940	16,940	3,000		
10. Fulton-Montgomery Comm. College (NY)	1,369	1,369	20,073	unk			20,073
11. Paris Jr. College (Texas)	743	743	24,900	24,900			
12. Vincennes Univ. (Indiana)	3,318	3,318	25,128	12,564	12,564		
13. Foothill College (California)	5,459	5,459	28,870	28,870			
30,000–49,999 Square Feet							
1. Jefferson College (Missouri)	1,391	1,391	31,826	31,826			
2. Casper College (Wyoming)	2,200	2,200	33,000	33,000			
3. SUNY-Canton	1,800	1,800	34,265	34,265			
4. Rockland Comm. College (NY)	—	—	37,000	7,000	30,000		
5. Grossmont College (California)	5,000	5,000	39,433	28,633	10,800		

Table TW9. Continued

Institution	1970 Undergrad. Enroll-ment	1970 Total Enroll-ment	Total Present Area	Original Building	1st Add.	2nd Add.	Replace-ment Building
6. Green River Comm. College (Wash.)	2,379	2,379	42,150	42,150			
7. Mohawk Valley Comm. College (NY)	2,083	2,083	47,900	25,500	22,400		
50,000–74,999 Square Feet							
1. SUNY Agri. & Tech. College at Alfred	2,800	2,800	64,000	64,000			
2. Middlesex County College (NJ)	2,500	2,500	74,000	74,000			
75,000–99,999 Square Feet							
1. Mt. Hood Comm. College (Oregon)	4,900	4,900	90,000	90,000			
100,000–124,999 Square Feet							
1. Lorain County Comm. College (Ohio)	1,762	1,762	112,000	112,000			
125,000–149,999 Square Feet							
1. William Rainey Harper College (Ill.)	2,578	2,578	131,652	131,652			

Table TW10. Composition of Policy Making Body
(22 Institutions Responding)

Group Represented on Policy Board	No. of Representatives								Total Unions				
	1	2	3	4	5	6–8	9–10	over 10	No.	%	Elected	Appointed	Ex-Officio
Institution's Governing Board	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
President	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	9	—	—	2
Vice-President	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Business Office	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	18	—	—	4
Student Affairs Dean	11	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	12	55	—	4	6
Faculty	5	2	1	1	1	1	—	—	11	50	1	6	2
Alumni	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Student Government	3	4	1	1	3	2	—	6	20	91	11	7	1
Union Board or Program	4	1	1	—	1	3	1	—	11	50	3	7	—
General Student Body	2	3	—	—	1	—	—	3	9	41	5	2	—
Union Staff	12	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	15	68	—	5	8
Other Administrative	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	3	14	—	2	—

6 Unions had no policy board.
5 Unions had Student Government as the policy making body.

Table TW11. ***Policy Making Body Responsible to What Authority***
(17 Institutions Responding)

Authority	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Union Staff	5	29
Student Government	2	12
President of College	1	5.5
Student Affairs Dean	6	37
Student Government & Student Affairs Dean	1	5.5
Faculty Senate	1	5.5
Trustees	1	5.5
TOTALS	17	

Table TW12. ***Chairman of Policy Making Body***
(18 Institutions Responding)

Chairman is Representative of:	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Union Program Board	3	17
Administration or Faculty	4	22
Student Government	4	22
Union Staff	3	17
Rotating System	2	11
Other	2	11
TOTALS	18	

Table TW13. ***Frequency of Meetings of Policy Making Body***
(18 Institutions Responding)

Frequency	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Semi-Weekly	—	—
Weekly	7	39
Semi-Monthly	3	17
Monthly	6	33
Quarterly	—	—
Semi-Annually	—	—
Annually	—	—
No Regular Schedule	2	11
TOTALS	18	

Table TW14. Composition of *Program* Board
(20 Institutions Responding)

Group Represented on Policy Board	No. of Representatives								Total Unions				
	1	2	3	4	5	6–8	9–10	over 10	No.	%	Elected	Appointed	Ex-Officio
Student Affairs Dean	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	15	—	—	1
Faculty	3	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	6	30	—	5	—
Alumni	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Student Government	8	2	—	—	—	1	—	3	14	70	8	1	1
General Student Body	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	15	75	8	5	—
Student Chairmen of Program Committee	12	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	15	75	8	6	—
Union Staff	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18	90	1	3	10
Other Administrative	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

7 had no program board.

3 same as policy board, listed on Chart 10.

*Table TW15. **Program** Board Responsible to What Authority (22 Institutions Responding)*

Authority	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Union Staff	8	36
Policy Making Board	1	5
Student Government	9	40
Student Associations or General Student Body	—	—
Student Affairs Dean	1	5
Union Staff & Student Government	3	14
TOTAL	22	

*Table TW16. Compensation for **Program** Board Members (26 Institutions Responding)*

Compensation	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Yes	8	31
No	18	69
TOTAL	26	

Yes—3 tuition 1 scholarship 1 $50/Quarter
1 unknown 1 $70/month 1 $300/Year

*Table TW17. Awards for **Program** Board Members (25 Institutions Responding)*

Awards	Total Unions No.	Total Unions %
Yes	12	48
No	13	52
TOTALS	25	

Yes—4 certificate 1 letter
2 plaque 5 unknown
1 semester scholarship

Table TW18. Number of Program Committees
(22 Institutions Responding)

No. of Committees	Total Unions		Enrollment			
	No.	%	Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
1-5	10	45	4	5	—	1
6	5	22	5	—	—	—
7	3	14	1	1	1	—
8	1	5	1	—	—	—
9	2	9	2	—	—	—
10	1	5	—	1	—	—
11	—	—	—	—	—	—
12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over 12	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	22					
No Program Committee	1					

Table TW19. Size of Program Committees
(18 Institutions Responding)

Average No. of Students Per Committee	Unions	
	Number	Per Cent
1-10	17	94
11-15	—	—
16-25	1	6
Over 25	—	—
TOTALS	18	

Table TW20. Types of Program Committees (20 Institutions Responding)

Committee	Total Committees No.	Total Committees %
Visual Arts, Exhibitions	12	60
Fine Arts—Cultural	10	50
Arts & Crafts	—	—
Exhibits	2	10
Performing Arts	8	40
Theatre	1	5
Concerts, Music	7	35
Social, Dance	20	100
General-Social	6	30
Dance	7	35
Coffee House-Night Club	7	35
Games-Tournaments	9	45
Special Events	12	60
Events (homecoming, parents)	12	60
Orientation	—	—
Lecture, Forum, Debate	13	65
Forum-Lecture	13	65
Literary	—	—
Debate	—	—
Political Union	—	—
Quiz Bowl	—	—
Model U.N.	—	—
Publicity, Public Relations	11	55
Publicity	9	45
Union Newsletter	—	—
Promotions	—	—
Master Calendar	1	5
Public Relations	1	5
Publications	—	—
Film	12	60
Film Presentation	12	60
Film Making	—	—
Services	6	30
House-Hospitality	4	20
Decorations	1	5
Secretarial	—	—
Arrangements	—	—
Student Services	1	5
Tickets	—	—
Transportation	—	—

Table TW21. Frequency of Program Committee Meetings (20 Institutions Responding)

Frequency of Meetings	Total Group		Individual Committees	
	No.	%	No.	%
Semi-Weekly	1	5	—	—
Weekly	8	40	7	35
Semi-Monthly	4	20	3	15
Monthly	4	20	—	—
Quarterly	—	—	—	—
Semi-Annually	—	—	—	—
Annually	—	—	—	—
Varies for Each Committee	—	—	—	—
Don't Meet All Together	1	5	—	—
No Regular Schedule (as needed)	2	10	8	40
TOTALS	20		18	

Table TW22. Number of Professional Staff Members Employed (33 Institutions Responding)

No. Staff Positions	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	19	58	11	65	6	55	2	50	—	—
Two	8	24	5	29	2	18	1	25	—	—
Three	5	15	1	6	3	27	—	—	1	100
Four	1	3	—	—	—	—	1	25	—	—
Five or more	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	33		17		11		4		1	

Of those with more than one staff member there were:
- 4 Administrative Assistants
- 3 Assistant Directors
- 3 Food Managers
- 3 Bookstore Managers
- 5 Program Directors
- 2 Night Managers

Table TW23. Educational Background of Union Director
(32 Institutions Responding)

				Enrollment											
	Total Unions			Under 2500 (17 unions)			2500-4999 (11 unions)			5000-9999 (3 unions)			Over 10,000 (1 union)		
	Bach.	Mas	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.	Bach.	Mas.	Dr.
Administration (school)	—	2	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Business	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Education	1	2	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
English	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fine Arts-Music, Drama	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guidance & Counseling	—	7	—	—	3	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Student Personnel	—	8	2	—	5	1	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Theology	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Physical Education	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
College Union Admin.	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
History-Political Science	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Hotel-Restaurant	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Psychology	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	3	26	3	3	12	2	—	10	1	—	3	—	—	1	—

Table TW24. Union Functions of Director
(31 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
	Total		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Union Function	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Student Programs and Activities	31	100	17	100	10	100	3	100	1	100
Food Service	11	35	7	41	2	20	2	67	—	—
Operation of Recreation Facilities	26	84	14	82	10	100	1	33	1	100
Bookstore Operation	4	13	3	18	—	—	1	33	—	—
Guest Room Operation	1	3	—	—	1	10	—	—	—	—
Building Maintenance	10	32	7	41	1	10	2	67	—	—
General Building Services	21	68	11	65	7	70	2	67	1	100
Physical Plant Department	3	10	2	12	—	—	1	33	—	—

Based on—17 Unions—Under 2500
10 Unions—2500-4999
3 Unions—5000-9999
1 Unions—Over 10,000

Table TW25. Line of Responsibility of Union Director
(31 Institutions Responding)

To Whom Director is Responsible	Total	
	No.	%
Student Affairs Dean	26	83
President	2	6
Associate Dean of Student Affairs	1	3
Business Manager	1	3
Student Affairs Dean & Business Manager	1	3
TOTAL	31	

Table TW26. NON-Union Functions of Union Director
(27 Institutions Responding)

Non-Union Function or Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
Student Activities Coordination*	6	22	4	—	1	1
Organization Advisor	2	7	1	1	—	—
General Student Personnel Work	3	11	—	2	1	—
Teaching	3	11	2	1	—	—
Campus Committee Work	2	7	1	1	—	—
Special Events-Scheduling Master Calendar	4	15	2	2	—	—
Parking	1	4	—	1	—	—
Placement	3	11	2	1	—	—
Residence Halls-Housing	3	11	2	1	—	—
Student Guidance & Counseling	3	11	2	1	—	—
Coaching-Athletics	3	11	1	2	—	—
Student Financial Aids	4	15	3	1	—	—
Business Office Functions	1	4	—	1	—	—
Health Services	1	4	—	1	—	—
Orientation Program	2	7	1	1	—	—
Convocation	1	4	1	—	—	—
I.D. Cards	2	7	1	1	—	—
Auxiliary Services	1	4	1	—	—	—
Commencement Program	2	7	1	1	—	—

*Many of the union directors in this section had the title of Director of Student Activities, so their main *union* function was student activities.

Table TW27. Years of Employment in Present Position of Union Director
(30 Institutions Responding)

Years	Total No.	Total %
1-2	14	47
3-5	12	40
6-10	3	10
11-15	1	3
16-25	—	—

Table TW28. Other Union Employment of Union Director (30 Institutions Responding)

No. of Positions Held					Total		
1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	Nature of Employment Experience
					13	43	No Previous union experience
6	1	—	—	—	7	23	Union director position at another college*
3	—	—	—	—	3	10	Subordinate union positions at present college
7	1	—	—	—	8	27	Subordinate union positions at other colleges
TOTALS					31		

*For this section this includes Activities Director at another college, as many had the title of Activities Director at their present college.

1 director held 2 positions—1 subordinate and 1 director at another college—these were listed separately

Table TW29. Previous Non-Union Employment of Union Director, By Type of Employment* (18 Institutions Responding)

	Total	
Type of Employment	No.	%
Educational	17	77
Coaching	—	—
Business	2	9
Government (State/Federal)	—	—
Hotel/Restaurant (includes food service in hospital, residence hall, etc.)	—	—
Religion	1	5
Service Field (career)	—	—
Service Field (non-career)	2	9
Entertainment	—	—
Youth-Recreation	—	—
TOTALS	22	

*If more than one type of occupation was given, they were all listed separately.

Table TW30. Previous Non-Union Employment of Union Director, By Number of Positions (30 Institutions Responding)

No. of Non-Union Positions Held	Total	
	No.	%
0	12	40
1	9	30
2	6	20
3	1	3
4	2	7
5 or more	—	—
TOTALS	30	

Table TW31. Union Fees (33 Institutions Responding)

Nature of Fee	Total		Nature of Fee	Total	
	No.	%		No.	%
Building Amortization & Operation Fees Combined	6	18	Separate Building Amortization & Operation Fees	1	3
Building Amortization Only	3	9	No Union Fee*	14	43
Operation Only	5	15	Activity Program Fee Only	4	12

*usually out of general college budget

Table TW32. Union Fee—By Semester (undergraduate only)
(11 Institutions Responding)

Fee Paid Per Semester*	Total		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%				
$0-1.99	1	9	—	—	1	—
2-4.99	3	28	1	1	—	1
5-9.99	1	9	—	1	—	—
10-14.99	1	9	1	—	—	—
15-19.99	2	18	1	1	—	—
20-24.99	—	—	—	—	—	—
25-29.99	2	18	2	—	—	—
30-34.99	—	—	—	—	—	—
35-39.99	1	9	1	—	—	—
40-44.99	—	—	—	—	—	—
Over $45	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	11		6	3	1	1

*Includes the four types of union fees listed in Table #31

Union Fees—by Quarter	*Under 2500*	*2500-4999*
	$2/quarter	$20/quarter
	$15/quarter	
Activities Fee—by Quarter	*Under 2500*	*5000-9999*
	$5/quarter	$7.60/quarter
	$14/quarter	

Table TW33. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Food Service
(29 Institutions Responding)

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Operated by:										
College union management	5	18	4	25	—	—	1	33	—	—
College dining service	10	34	6	37.5	4	50	—	—	—	—
Institutional caterer	14	48	6	37.5	4	40	3	67	1	100
Other arrangement	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	29		16		8		4		1	
Total Food Service Operations are:										
Entirely self-supporting	13	68	5	50	6	100	2	50	—	—
Subsidized as to any losses	6	32	5	50	—	—	1	25	—	—
TOTALS	19		10		6		3			
Expected to contribute profits to total operation	9	64	6	75	1	33	2	100	—	—
Expected to divert profits elsewhere	3	22	1	12.5	1	33	—	—	1	100
Subject to union rental charge for space	1	7	—	—	1	33	—	—	—	—
Other	1	7	1	12.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	14		8		3		2		1	

Table TW33. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Food Service
(29 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Purchases are handled by:										
College Union management	5	18	4	25	—	—	1	25	—	—
College dining service	10	34	6	38	3	37.5	1	25	—	—
Institutional caterer	11	38	4	25	4	50	2	50	1	100
College purchasing department	2	7	1	6	1	12.5	—	—	—	—
Institutional caterer & college purchasing dept.	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	29		16		8		4		1	

Enrollment Breakdown—Under 2500—16 Unions; 2500-4999—8 Unions 5000-9999—4 Unions; Over 10,000—1 Union
2 Unions had only Vending service—1 Under 2500 1-2500-4999

Table TW34. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Bookstore
(30 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Operated by:										
College Union Management	4	13	3	21.4	—	—	1	25	1	100
College Business Office	18	60	8	57	7	64	2	50	—	—
Other Arrangements	8	27	3	21.4	4	36	1	25	—	—
TOTALS	30		14		11		4		1	
Bookstore Operations are:										
Entirely Self-supporting	16	84	7	78	7	100	2	67	—	—
Subsidized as to Any Losses	3	16	2	22	—	—	1	33	—	—
TOTALS	19		9		7		3			
Expected to Devote % of Profits to Union:										
0-25%	2		1		—		1		—	
26-50%	—		—		—		—		—	
51-75%	—		—		—		—		—	
76-100%	2		1		1		—		—	
Unknown percent	3		3		—		—		—	
SUB-TOTALS	7	41	5	45	1	33	1	100	—	—
Expected to Devote Profits Elsewhere	7	41	4	37	2	67	—	—	1	100
Subject to Union Rental Charge for Space	3	18	2	18	1	33	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	17		11		4		1		1	

Enrollment Breakdown—Under 2500—14 Unions 2500-4999—11 Unions
5000-9999—4 Unions Over 10,000—1 Unions

Table TW35. *Union Revenue Producing Departments—Concessions (all schools)*
(30 Institutions Responding)

Type of Concessions	Total	Operating Basis						Profits*					
		Union		Commis-sion		Space Rental		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Telephones	9	1	11	6	67	2	22	2	22	3	33	1	11
Juke Box	22	7	31	14	64	1	5	7	31	5	23	1	5
Vending Machines	30	6	20	22	73	2	7	14	47	7	23	2	7
Vending Machines Elsewhere on Campus	15	2	13	13	87	—	—	2	13	7	47	1	7
Pin Ball Machines	11	3	27	7	64	1	9	4	36	3	27	1	9
Copy Machines	3	—	—	2	67	1	33	1	33	2	67	—	—
Post Office, Gov't. Sub-station or Contract Station	1	1	100	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Coin-operated Laundry Machines	1	—	—	1	100	—	—	—	—	1	100	—	—
Pocket Billiard Table	4	1	25	3	75	—	—	3	75	—	—	—	—
Games Room & Equipment	2	2	100	—	—	—	—	1	50	1	50	—	—

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table TW36. Union Revenue Producing Departments—Other (all schools)
(27 Institutions Responding)

Department	Total	Self-Supporting		Subsidized		Total Union Operation		Diverted Elsewhere		Both	
						Profits*					
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Games	19	14	74	5	26	9	47	4	21	—	—
Movies	18	2	11	16	89	3	17	—	—	—	—
Program	17	2	12	15	88	3	18	—	—	—	—
General Services/Merchandise Desk	13	5	38	8	62	5	38	—	—	—	—
Hall Rentals	4	4	100	—	—	2	50	2	50	—	—
Office Rentals	1	1	100	—	—	1	100	—	—	—	—
Swimming Pool-Fees	1	1	100	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Recreation Equipment Rentals (Bikes, Boats, Skies, etc.)	6	5	83	1	17	3	50	—	—	—	—
School Supplies, Paper Back Books, (other than Bookstore)	4	4	100	—	—	2	50	—	—	1	25
Parking fees	4	4	100	—	—	—	—	3	75	1	25
Craft Shop Sales	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Art Sales	2	2	100	—	—	2	100	—	—	—	—

*Since all schools answering this question did not indicate where their profits go, there is, therefore, an unknown percent in the profits area.

Table TW37. Use of Facilities for Union Program, By Enrollment
(30 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500–4999	5000–9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Program Held Entirely Within Union	6	20	5	1	—	—
Other College Facilities Supplement Union's Facilities	24	80	10	9	4	1
Programming Done by Other Facility	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	30		15	10	4	1

Table TW38. Other Facilities Used to Supplement Union's Facilities, By Enrollment
(23 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500–4999	5000–9999	Over 10,000
Facility Used	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Theatre	7	30	2	3	2	—
Auditorium	7	30	4	2	1	1
Field House, Gym or Coliseum	13	57	6	5	2	—
Fine Arts Building	4	17	1	2	1	—
Dorms, Recreation Areas or Lounges	3	13	1	2	—	—
Classrooms-Lecture Halls	9	39	2	4	2	1
Commons, Dining Hall	3	13	2	1	—	—
Library, Learning Resource Center	3	13	1	2	—	—
Recreation Facilities, Private or City	2	9	—	2	—	—
College Recreation Areas	1	[illegible]	—	—	1	—

Table TW39. Responsibility for Union Program Planning and Execution, By Enrollment
(31 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
No Planned Program	1	3	—	1	—	—
Program Planned and Executed by Professional Staff	2	6	1	—	1	—
Program Planned and Executed by Coordinated Effort of Program Board, Committees and Staff	26	84	15	8	2	1
Other*	2	6	—	1	1	—
TOTALS	31		16	10	4	1

*Student Government

Table TW40. Total Cost of Free Union Programs, By Enrollment
(21 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Under $500	—	—	—	—	—	—
$500-999	—	—	—	—	—	—
$1,000-1,999	2	10	1	—	1	—
$2,000-2,999	—	—	—	—	—	—
$3,000-4,999	2	10	2	—	—	—
$5,000-7,499	1	5	1	—	—	—
$7,500-9,999	2	10	—	2	—	—
$10,000-19,999	3	14	1	2	—	—
$20,000-29,999	4	18	4	—	—	—
$30,000-39,999	4	18	2	1	1	—
$40,000-50,000	2	10	1	1	—	—
Over $50,000	1	5	—	—	—	1

Table TW41. Cost of Union Programs Per Full-Time Day Student, By Enrollment
(21 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Under $1.00	1	5	—	—	1	—
$1-1.99	2	10	2	—	—	—
$2-2.99	2	10	—	2	—	—
$3-3.99	—	—	—	—	—	—
$4-4.99	3	14	1	1	—	1
$5-9.99	3	14	1	1	1	—
$10-14.99	4	19	3	1	—	—
$15-20	4	19	3	1	—	—
Over $20	2	10	2	—	—	—
TOTALS	21		12	6	2	1

Table TW42. Responsibility for Union Maintenance Staff, By Enrollment
(31 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Maintenance Staff primarily responsible to the College Maintenance Department	30	97	17	10	2	1
Maintenance Staff primarily responsible to Union Management	1	3	—	—	1	—
TOTALS	31		17	10	3	1

Table TW43. Financing Union Maintenance Salaries, By Enrollment (27 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Salaries of Maintenance Staff charged to general College budget	14	52	8	5	—	1
Salaries of Maintenance Staff charged to Maintenance Department	7	26	5	2	—	—
Salaries of Maintenance Staff charged to Union	2	7	1	—	1	—
Union Shares part of the salary expense of its Maintenance Staff	4	15	3	1	—	—
TOTALS	27		17	8	1	1

Table TW44. Financing Union Maintenance Supplies, By Enrollment (26 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Maintenance supplies furnished by Maintenance Department	24	92	13	8	2	1
Maintenance supplies paid for by the Union	2	8	1	—	1	—
TOTALS	26		14	8	3	1

Table TW45. Financing Union Building Repairs, By Enrollment
(25 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment			
			Under 2500	2500-4999	5000-9999	Over 10,000
	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	No.
Repairs paid for by the Maintenance Department	17	68	11	4	1	1
Repairs paid for by the Union	6	24	2	3	1	—
Union Shares part of the salary expense of its Maintenance Staff	2	8	2	—	—	—
TOTALS	25		15	7	2	1

Table TW46. Miscellaneous Services Available in Unions
(32 Institutions Responding)

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Service	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Bulletin Board Space	29	91	15	88	10	100	3	75	1	100
Lost & Found Department	24	75	12	71	9	90	2	50	1	100
Ticket Sales	24	75	12	71	9	90	3	75	—	—
Travel Board	20	63	8	47	4	40	2	50	1	100
PA Announcements	21	66	8	47	8	80	4	100	1	100
Free Telephones	6	19	2	12	2	20	1	25	1	100
Record Library	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Check Cashing	6	19	5	29	—	—	1	25	—	—
Clearing House for Talent	16	50	8	47	6	60	1	25	1	100
Print & Painting Library	6	19	1	6	4	40	1	25	—	—
Typing-Duplicating	14	44	8	47	5	50	—	—	1	100
Housing List	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Personal Notices Board	27	84	13	76	9	90	4	100	1	100
General Travel Service	9	28	4	24	2	20	2	50	1	100
Master Calendar of Campus Events	29	91	14	82	10	100	4	100	1	100

Table TW46. Continued

	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
Service	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
General Campus Information	30	94	5	29	10	100	4	100	1	100
Mail Boxes for Student Organizations	24	75	11	65	8	80	4	100	1	100
Message Slots for Individual Students	3	9	1	6	—	—	2	50	—	—
Directory Services (phone numbers & addresses of students)	12	38	8	47	4	40	—	—	—	—
Postage Selling, Weighing	6	19	4	24	1	10	1	25	—	—
Postage Vending Machines	9	28	4	24	2	20	2	50	1	100
Sign and Poster Making	24	75	12	71	8	80	4	100	—	—
Outdoor Recreation Equipment Rentals	7	22	2	12	4	40	1	25	—	—
Baby Sitting or Day Care Center	3	9	—	—	2	20	1	25	—	—
Special Charter Flights	4	13	1	6	2	20	1	25	—	—
Guided Campus Tours	10	31	6	35	2	20	2	50	—	—
Storage Lockers or Closets for Student Organizations	15	47	6	35	5	50	3	75	1	100
Beer Service—	4	13								
Snack Bar	—	—	2	12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private Dining Room	—	—	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Special Occasions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Liquor Service—	1	3								
Private Dining Room	—	—	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Waiter Service— Dining Room	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Special Occasions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Copy Machines	6	19	1	6	4	40	1	25	—	—

Table TW47. Equipment Loaned for Use Outside the Union Building (17 Institutions Responding)

	Unions with Loan Policy*	
Kind of Equipment	No.	%
Tables	12	71
Chairs	11	65
Kitchen Utensils, etc.	4	24
Recreation Equipment	9	53
P.A. Equipment	10	59
Movie-Slide Projectors	6	35
Office Machines	1	6
Lighting Equipment	2	12

*the question asked for Unions with Loan Policy and Unions charging for Loan—all of those in this chapter did not charge for equipment loaned out.

Table TW48. Union Building Facilities
(33 Institutions Responding)

Facility	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Recreation Facilities:										
Billiard Room	25	76	12	71	9	82	3	75	1	100
Table Tennis	24	73	13	76	8	73	2	50	1	100
Bowling	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Swimming Pool	2	6	1	6	1	9	—	—	—	—
Card Room	16	48	8	47	5	45	2	50	1	100
Table Shuffleboard	3	9	2	12	1	9	—	—	—	—
Gymnasium (adequate for volleyball, basketball)	3	9	1	6	1	9	1	25	—	—
Other Exercise Rooms (weight lifting, exercycle, etc.)	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Boat House, with boats, canoes to rent	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Ski Shop, with skis to rent	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Outing Center or Lodge away from Campus	2	6	1	6	1	9	—	—	—	—
Chess Room (separate from Card Room or Snack Bar)	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Social Facilities:										
Ballroom	10	30	5	29	3	27	2	50	—	—
Party Room	4	12	2	12	1	9	—	—	1	100
Lounge	28	85	14	82	10	91	3	75	1	100
Faculty Lounge	10	30	5	29	4	36	—	—	1	100
Coffee House (separate from Snack Bar)	6	18	4	24	1	9	1	25	—	—

Table TW48. Continued

Facility	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Outdoor Terrace or Patio (for Lounging, Refreshments, outdoor social and music Programming, etc.)	20	61	9	53	7	64	3	75	1	100
Lounge or Powder Room for Women only	8	24	2	12	4	36	1	25	1	100
Lounge for Men only	3	9	1	6	1	9	—	—	1	100
"Program Lounge" (i.e., primarily for scheduled discussions, readings, music and T.V. programs, film talks, etc.)	18	55	9	53	4	36	4	100	1	100
Faculty Lounge *exclusively* for faculty and their guests	8	24	3	18	2	18	2	50	1	100
Cultural-Hobby Facilities:										
Music Room (listening)	8	24	3	18	5	45	—	—	—	—
Music Room (practice)	2	6	—	—	1	9	1	25	—	—
Art Exhibition—	33									
Art Gallery (separate, enclosed area)	12	36	7	41	3	27	2	50	—	—
Corridor Art Cases	9	27	5	29	4	36	—	—	—	—
Lounge Exhibition Space	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Corridor-Lobby Exhibition Space	11	33	6	35	3	27	2	50	—	—
Photo Dark Room	7	21	4	24	3	27	—	—	—	—
Poster Room	12	36	6	35	6	55	—	—	—	—
Outing Headquarters	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Amateur Radio Room	3	9	2	12	1	9	—	—	—	—

Table TW48. Continued

Facility	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Auditorium	3	9	1	6	1	9	1	25	—	—
Theatre	6	18	3	18	2	18	1	25	—	—
Theatre Rehearsal Rooms	2	6	1	6	1	9	—	—	—	—
Television Room	12	36	8	47	3	27	—	—	1	100
Browsing Room	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Paperback Book Center— Browsing and Sales (Separate from Bookstore)	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Meeting Facilities:										
Small Committee Room	25	76	12	71	9	82	4	100	—	—
Meeting Room	26	79	12	71	9	82	4	100	1	100
Kitchenette	5	15	3	18	2	18	—	—	—	—
Service Facilities:										
Coat Room (unattended)	10	30	5	29	5	45	—	—	—	-
Check Room (attended)	5	15	1	6	2	18	2	50	—	—
Information Desk	21	64	12	71	7	64	1	25	1	100
Public (pay) Phones	29	88	15	88	10	91	3	75	1	100
House Phones	13	39	6	35	4	36	2	50	1	100
Postal Service	7	21	5	29	1	9	1	25	—	—
Post Office Government Sub Station	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Individual Mail Boxes	8	24	6	35	1	9	—	—	1	100
Ticket Office	11	33	8	47	3	27	—	—	—	—

Table TW48. Continued

			Enrollment							
	Total Unions		Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
Facility	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Lockers	11	33	6	35	5	45	—	—	—	—
Parking Area	16	48	10	59	5	45	—	—	1	100
Barber Shop	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Bank	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Nursery or Child Day Care Room	3	9	—	—	2	18	1	25	—	—
Typing Room	2	6	1	6	1	9	—	—	—	—
Print Shop for Job Printing	10	30	7	41	2	18	1	25	—	—
Food Facilities:										
Cafeteria	20	61	9	53	7	64	3	75	1	100
Snack Bar	26	78	14	82	9	82	2	50	1	100
Restaurant-type Dining Room	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Private Dining Room	12	36	4	24	6	55	1	25	1	100
Vending Machine Room	18	55	10	59	8	73	—	—	—	—
Banqueting	17	52	10	59	5	45	1	25	1	100
Kitchenette (self-service)	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Commuter Facilities:										
Lockers	8	24	4	24	3	27	—	—	1	100
Lounge	8	24	5	29	3	27	—	—	—	—
Dining Room	2	6	2	12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cot Room	4	12	1	6	2	18	1	25	—	—
Dressing Room	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Office Space	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table TW48. Continued

Facility	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500–4999		5000–9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Organization-Activity Facilities										
Campus newspaper	19	58	10	59	7	64	1	25	1	100
Year Book Office	17	52	10	59	6	55	—	—	1	100
Union-Board Committee Office	13	39	7	41	5	45	1	25	—	—
Student government Office	24	73	13	76	8	73	2	50	1	100
Student Council or Senate Chamber (special room designed for open Senate meetings)	22	67	10	59	8	73	4	100	—	—
IFC Office	1	3	—	—	—	—	1	25	—	—
Alumni Office	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
International Student Office	3	9	1	6	2	18	—	—	—	—
General Work Room	14	42	4	24	8	73	2	50	—	—
Radio Station	8	24	4	24	3	27	1	25	—	—
Office (only) for International Club	3	9	—	—	2	18	1	25	—	—
Office for minority organizations (i.e. black students)	10	30	3	18	3	27	4	100	—	—
Club Rooms primarily for use of minority student groups	1	3	—	—	—	—	1	25	—	—
Fraternity, Sorority Chapter Rooms or Lounges (exclusive use)	2	6	1	6	—	—	1	25	—	—
Communications Center (lobby area for student display, tables, sales, petitions)	19	58	9	53	8	73	2	50	—	—
Interview Rooms (committee recruiting interviews, job interviews, etc.)	9	27	5	29	4	36	—	—	—	—

Table TW48. Continued

Facility	Total Unions		Enrollment							
			Under 2500		2500-4999		5000-9999		Over 10,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Wall Cases for promotional displays, trophies, etc.	18	55	8	47	5	45	4	100	1	100
Mail Boxes for Organizations	20	61	8	47	8	73	3	75	1	100
Storage Lockers for Organizations	11	33	5	29	4	36	2	50	—	—
Other Facilities:										
Bookstore	25	76	12	71	8	73	3	75	1	100
Union Staff Administrative and Program Offices	29	88	14	82	11	100	3	75	1	100
Religious Counselor	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Counselor Office	3	9	1	6	—	—	1	25	1	100
Faculty Offices	1	3	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Veterans Assistant Office	1	3	—	—	—	—	1	25	—	—
Housing Office	1	3	—	—	—	—	1	25	—	—
Clothing Store (separate from Bookstore)	2	6	—	—	2	18	—	—	—	—
Central Mailing, duplicating room (mimeograph, offset, addressing, postage metering machines, etc.)	7	21	3	18	3	27	1	25	—	—
Rooms for Study Primarily	5	15	3	18	2	18	—	—	—	—
Adult conference or Adult Education Facilities:										
Lobby-Lounge (separate from Main Union lounge)	2	6	2	12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Registration-Reception area	3	9	2	12	1	9	—	—	—	—
Information Desk (separate from Main Union Desk)	3	9	2	12	1	9	—	—	—	—
Small Conference Rooms	11	33	6	35	4	36	1	25	—	—
Larger Meeting and Seminar Rooms	8	24	3	18	5	45	—	—	—	—
Conference Auditorium (separate from general Union auditorium or ballroom)	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Conference Administration Offices	1	3	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—
Private Dining Rooms	4	12	1	6	3	27	—	—	—	—

Table TW49. Facilities Most Commonly Provided in Two-Year College Unions/Centers
(33 Colleges Responding)

Facility	No. of 2-Year Colleges Providing	% of 2-Year Colleges Providing	% of All Colleges Providing (4 yr and 2 yr.)
Staff Administrative Offices	29	88	88
Lounge	28	85	89
Snack Bar	26	79	87
Meeting Rooms	26	79	88
Bookstore	25	76	75
Small Committee Rooms	25	76	84
Billiard Room	25	76	91
Table Tennis	24	73	79
Student Government Office	24	73	78
Information Desk	21	64	88
Cafeteria	20	61	74
Mail Boxes for Organizations	20	61	67
Campus Newspaper	19	58	67
Communications center (lobby area for student display tables, sales, etc.)	19	58	67
Program Lounge	18	55	42
Vending Room	18	55	49
Year Book Office	17	52	60
Banqueting	17	52	76
Other Facilities provided by less than 50% of 2-year college unions, and substantially exceeded by percent of ALL college unions providing, except in five cases			
Parking Area	16	48	53
Card Room	16	48	47
General Workroom for Stud. Organization	14	42	45
Union Committee Office	13	39	67
Private Dining [illegible]	12	36	49
TV Room	12	36	70
Poster Room	12	36	51
Art Gallery	12	36	24
Lockers	11	33	59
Coat Room	10	30	54
Faculty Lounge	10	30	29

Table TW49. Continued

Facility	No. of 2-Year Colleges Providing	% of 2-Year Colleges Providing	% of All Colleges Providing (4 yr and 2yr.)
Ballroom	10	30	73
Print Shop for Job Printing	10	30	20
Auditorium or Theater	9	27	43
Music Listening Room	8	24	55
Individual Mail Boxes	8	24	30
Photo Darkroom	7	21	51
Party Room	4	12	28
Browsing Room	1	3	24

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY